FBIS DAILY REPORT
CONTENTS
Middle East & North Africa
Vol V No 5 *9 January 1978*

ARABIAN PENINSULA

SAUDI ARABIA

'Israeli Inflexibility' Threatens Search for Peace C 1 1/A5
Cabinet Meets, Reviews Carter, Boumediene Visits C 1 1/A5
Foreign Minister Reports on Talks With Boumediene C 2 1/A6
Prince Fahd Receives U.S. Congressional Delegation C 2 1/A6
U.S. Urged To Further Promote Middle East Peace C 3 1/A7
['UKAZ 4 Jan 78]

YEMEN--YAR

Saudi Envoy Conveys Message From King to Al-Ghashmi C 3 1/A7

EGYPT

As-Sadat Returns to Aswan From Khartoum 8 Jan D 1 1/A 8
Meeting With Press D 1 1/A 8
As-Sadat Receives Letter From President Carter D 1 1/A 8
U.S. Congressional Delegation Arrives in Aswan D 1 1/A8
Meeting With As-Sadat D 1 1/A8
As-Sadat Statement D 2 1/A9
Meeting With Mar'i D 2 1/A9
Meeting With Salim D 3 1/A10
Spokesman Condemns New Israeli Settlements D 4 1/A11
Mubarak Requests Begin Statement on Settlements D 4 1/A11
AL-AHRAM Reports Proposed Political Committee Agenda [9 Jan 78] D 5 1/A12
As-Sadat Interviewed by OCTOBER Chief Editor [8 Jan 78] D 5 1/A12
As-Sadat To Meet Callaghan in Aswan 13 Jan D 16 1/B9

IRAQ

Husayn Receives Palestinian Rejectionist Leaders E 1 1/B10
Habash Calls for Arab Front E 1 1/B10
Ba'thist-Lebanese Nationalist Talks Begin in Baghdad E 2 1/B11
Husayn Cables Congratulations to Turkey's Ecevit E 2 1/B11

JORDAN

Husayn Sends Message to Al-Asad on Teheran Talks F 1 1/B12
Husayn Would Visit Egypt 'Under Appropriate Circumstances' F 1 1/B12
[AD-DUSTUR 9 Jan 78]
Algerian President Boumediene To Arrive 10 Jan F 1 1/B12
JORDAN TIMES: Carter's Remarks on Palestinians 'Hasty' [8 Jan 78] F 1 1/B12
AD-DUSTUR Criticizes Israeli Settlements, U.S. Stand [7 Jan 78] F 2 1/B13
Information Minister Leaves for Saudi Arabia F 2 1/B13

SYRIA

Al-Asad Meets With U.S. Congressional Delegation H 1 1/B14
Text of Al-Asad Interview With NEWSWEEK's De Borchgrave H 1 1/B14
ATH-THAWRAH: As-Sadat's Moves Drive Peace Away H 9 1/C8

NORTH AFRICA

SUDAN

Materials on As-Sadat's Visit to Sudan 7-8 Jan I 1 1/C9
Cairo Relay of Arrival I 1 1/C9
Omdurman Report on Arrival I 1 1/C9
As-Sadat Airport Press Conference I 1 1/C9
As-Sadat, Numayri Talks I 2 1/C10
Sudanese Officials' Statements I 3 1/C11
Numayri Statement to MENA I 3 1/C11
As-Sadat, Numayri Press Conference I 4 1/C12
As-Sadat Leaves Khartoum I 13 1/D7
Views 'Completely Identical' I 13 1/D7
Defense Council To Meet Soon I 13 1/D7

ISRAEL

Begin Issues Warning to Egypt at Herut Party Meeting N 1 1/D8
Jordan, PLO Roles Discounted N 3 1/D10
POST Report on Meeting [9 Jan 78] N 3 1/D10
Peres Endorses Begin Statement N 4 1/D11
Prime Minister's Office Defends Rafah Activity N 4 1/D11
Cabinet Votes To Strengthen Existing Sinai Settlements N 5 1/D12
Cabinet Secretary's Report N 5 1/D12
Labor Raps Cabinet's 'Confusion' N 6 1/D13
9 Jan Press Comment N 6 1/D13
Proposals for Joint Military Committee Discussion Outlined N 7 1/D14
Cabinet Approves Delegations to Talks With Egypt N 8 1/E1
DAVAR: No Concessions on Sinai Early Warning Stations [8 Jan 78] N 9 1/E2
Dayan Comments on Political Committee Agenda, Peace Talks N 9 1/E2
Previews Talks With Pope N 10 1/E3

SOUTH ASIA

BANGLADESH

British Prime Minister Ends Official Visit S 1 1/E4

INDIA

British Prime Minister Callaghan Arrives in Delhi S 1 1/E4
Meets Desai, Calls on President S 2 1/E5
Callaghan, Desai Speak at Reception S 2 1/E5
Desai, Callaghan Continue Talks S 4 1/E7
Callaghan Addresses News Conference S 5 1/E8

PAKISTAN

UAE's Al Nuhayyan Arrives in Karachi 7 Jan S 5 1/E8

Item 856-B-6 PrEx 7.10:FBIS-MEA-78-5

JAN 19 1978

FBIS-MEA-78-5
Monday
9 January 1978
Vol V No 5

DAILY REPORT

CONTIN

COMPLETED
ORIGINAL

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Available for Distribution
From NTIS

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

This publication contains current news and commentary monitored by FBIS from foreign broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, and periodicals. Items are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign-language sources are translated by FBIS. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS. Labels such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how FBIS processed the information from the original. Names rendered phonetically or in transliteration are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clearly heard but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

Users of this publication may cite FBIS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying it as the secondary source. For example: "FBIS reports that Radio Moscow announced . . ." or "FBIS has monitored a broadcast from Hanoi which says . . ."

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

SAUDI ARABIA

'ISRAELI INFLEXIBILITY' THREATENS SEARCH FOR PEACE

LD0900J6Y Riyadh Domestic Service in Arabic 2000 GMT 8 Jan 78 LD

[Husayn al-'Askari commentary]

[Excerpts] An Egyptian Foreign Ministry spokesman has stated that Israel's continued building of more settlements in the Arab territory occupied in 1967 places the intentions of the Israelis in doubt in regard to the efforts for peace.

In actual fact, the attempt of the Israeli enemy to continue the construction of new settlements in occupied Arab territory after the new moves in the direction of finding a just and lasting peace has not taken the Arab nation by surprise. This nation has exposed the intentions of the enemy and is well experienced in the enemy's cunning and deceit. This attempt has demonstrated to the world that the Arabs are quite right in all they have said about the Israeli ambitions that hide behind the calls for a solution leading to peace, a solution that suits Israeli plans.

In order to show the impudence and insolence of the Israeli enemy it is quite sufficient to cite here that the United States, which supports Israel's existence, expressed its anger and condemnation of the Israeli moves to establish more settlements in occupied Arab territory.

In the shadow of Israeli stubbornness, which is indefensible, the next stage in the search for a formula for just and lasting peace is precarious. The first and last reason is Israeli inflexibility. This inflexibility is no longer justified.

CABINET MEETS, REVIEWS CARTER, BOUMEDIENE VISITS

LD0819J6Y Riyadh Domestic Service in Arabic 1800 GMT 8 Jan 78 LD

[Excerpt] The Council of Ministers held a meeting this evening chaired by His Royal Highness Prince Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, the crown prince and deputy prime minister. The meeting continued until 2000 today.

Information Minister Dr Muhammad 'Abduh Yamani told the SAUDI NEWS AGENCY that at the beginning of its meeting the council heard a statement by His Royal Highness Prince Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz on the dimensions of the talks between His Majesty King Khalid, his highness and his excellency the U.S. president, Jimmy Carter, during his visit.

The information minister said that his highness informed the council of the results of those talks, which had embraced bilateral relations, current Arab questions in particular, and the Middle East problem in general. His highness also explained to the council the results of the talks between His Majesty King Khalid, his highness the crown prince and President Houari Boumediene, during the latter's visit.

The information minister said that the council heard a statement by His Royal Highness Prince Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz on the dimensions of Saudi policy in the field of current Arab issues and the Palestinian question in particular. His highness said: God willing, under the direction of his majesty, may God protect him, we will continue our policy, which seeks to close ranks, unite the Arabs and heal the discord, and work to shield the Arab and Islamic nation against anything that harms its interests, stability and safety at present and in the future. We will not spare any effort or potential at our disposal to serve this purpose.

His highness said: There will be no real stability or peace in the area unless the real and actual elements of peace are taken into consideration, and foremost of these elements are the return of all the occupied Arab territory to its former status, restoration of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, and granting them full right to self-determination. In our opinion, this is what will lead to a just and genuine peace in the area.

His Highness Prince Fahd said: We are committed to the resolutionns of the Arab summit conference in Rabat and we consider the PLO the legitimate representative of the Palestinians in accordance with what was agreed upon in the Rabat conference. His highness said: The situation calls for sincere, courageous and honest action to bring the Arab nation back to the fold and unify its ranks and coordinate its efforts so that the desired objectives, which could bring a just and genuine peace, may be realized.

FOREIGN MINISTER REPORTS ON TALKS WITH BOUMEDIENE

LD061230Y Riyadh Domestic Service in Arabic 1130 GMT 6 Jan 78 LD

[Text] His Royal Highness Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal, foreign minister, said that the Saudi-Algerian talks have resulted in full agreement that this stage necessitates first and foremost the unity of the Arab rank to confront the fateful challenges. It also requires that everyone should abide by the resolutions of Arab unanimity to preserve the Arab sublime interest and to achieve the pan-Arab aims of the Arab nation.

In a statement to the SAUDI NEWS AGENCY correspondent in which he commented on the talks which his majesty the king and his royal highness the crown prince conducted with his excellency the Algerian president, Houari Boumediene, his highness said this visit provided an opportunity to exchange views between the two sides on what is confronting the Arab nation at this critical phase of its destiny. The foreign minister added that the talks were characterized by complete frankness and responsible understanding that the phase which the Arab nation is passing through requires self-restraint and action to combat negative attitudes.

PRINCE FAHD RECEIVES U.S. CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

LD082230Y Riyadh Domestic Service in Arabic 1800 GMT 8 Jan 78 LD

[Text] His Royal Highness Prince Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz al Sa'ud, crown prince and deputy prime minister, received at his office at Al-Ma'ther Palace at 1630 today the U.S. congressional delegation headed by Senator Harrison Williams, member of the banking, housing and manpower subcommittees. The delegation was presented to his highness by John West, U.S. ambassador to Saudi Arabia.

His Highness Prince Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz al Sa'ud held a closed meeting with the delegation during which his highness reviewed the current developments in the Middle East. The U.S. delegation explained to his highness the purpose of its current tour to some of the countries in the area. At the beginning of the meeting Prince Fahd welcomed the members of the U.S. delegation, wishing them a pleasant stay in the kingdom. He told them to note the numerous aspects of development now taking place in the country. He also asked them to see the ancient monuments in Mada'in Salih.

Members of the delegation thanked his highness for the hospitality and they praised the development now going on in the kingdom. They stressed to his highness their admiration for the kingdom's miraculous progress and development made possible by the efforts of its leaders in the service of this aim. They also confirmed that the kingdom, which has proven to the entire world that its policy is just, will attain its desired aims as a result of its wise and balanced policy. The meeting was attended by Dr Rashad Fir'awn, his majesty's private adviser.

U.S. URGED TO FURTHER PROMOTE MIDDLE EAST PEACE

LD061752Y Jidda 'UKAZ in Arabic 4 Jan 78 p 1 LD

[Editorial]

[Text] Attention has been focused on the outcome of the Saudi-U.S. summit talks in order to give momentum to the efforts to achieve a just peace in the area following the Israeli attitude toward such efforts and Israel's insistence on refusing to give up the Arab lands it occupied in the 1967 aggression and on disregarding the Palestinian people's legitimate rights to establish a state on their own territory.

The Arabs have always emphasized their desire for peace because of their belief that peace in the Middle East is part of world peace and the need to keep their area free of spheres of foreign influence and tension. They have made big strides on the path of peace, strides whose momentum must be increased and maintained so that this peace opportunity will not be lost forever because of the Israeli attitude.

Since the United States declared its desire for peace and President Carter, declared that the Palestinians have a right to a homeland, the present efforts must assume a greater and more positive role so they will bear fruit and lead to the achievement of a just peace in the area, which is of extreme importance to the whole world.

The current U.S. effort should also be directed toward Israel as well, so that an end may be put to the present procrastination and time wasting that might hamper the peace process. The Arabs have continuously reiterated their demand that Israel should comply with the desires of the international will and the UN resolutions that condemn the occupation of land by force and the Israeli practices in the occupied Arab lands.

Israel's evacuation of the occupied Arab lands and the rights of Palestinians to their state are the key factors to the achievement of peace and the only way to achieve security for all the countries of the area. Any violation of any such right is a violation of peace and would result in continued tension. Therefore, the United States must continue its efforts and must not let this real opportunity be lost forever.

YEMEN--YAR

SAUDI ENVOY CONVEYS MESSAGE FROM KING TO AL-GHASHMI

JN071753Y San'a' Domestic Service in Arabic 1700 GMT 7 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Brother Lieutenant Colonel Ahmad Husayn al-Ghashmi, Command Council chairman and commander in chief of the armed forces, today received the Saudi Arabia charge d'affaires in San'a', who conveyed to the brother president a verbal message from Saudi King Khalid ibn Abd al-Aziz. During the meeting discussions dealt with brotherly relations between the two fraternal countries.

AS-SADAT RETURNS TO ASWAN FROM KHARTOUM 8 JAN

NC081316Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1306 GMT 8 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Aswan, 8 January--President Muhammad Anwar as-Sadat and the delegation accompanying him returned to Aswan this afternoon from Khartoum after a 24-hour visit during which he had discussions with Sudanese President Ja'far Numayri. President as-Sadat was welcomed on arrival in Aswan Airport at 1420 by Vice President Muhammad Husni Mubarak, Aswan Governor Maj Gen Kamal Khayrallah, popular and executive leaders, and Moslem and Christian religious dignitaries in the province.

Meeting With Press

NC081438Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1415 GMT 8 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Aswan, 8 January--President Muhammad Anwar as-Sadat has stated that his journey to Sudan was indeed splendid.

Answering reporters questions at Aswan Airport upon arrival from Khartoum, the president said: President Numayri and I discussed several questions, the peace initiative and African problems in general, and the Horn of Africa in particular. The president said: During the Khartoum discussions we agreed on specific moves to strengthen Arab solidarity. He added: I was greatly moved by the splended reception accorded me by the Sudanese people.

Asked whether he has received proposals on the formation of a joint administration by Jordan, Palestine and Israel for the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, the president said: I have not received such proposals but I hope that if there is something on this it will be discussed during the meeting of the political committee which will convene in Jerusalem on 16 January.

Answering another question, President as-Sadat said: I agree to the right to self-determination for the Palestinians. For this reason I said that the viewpoints were identical during the talks President Carter and I held in Aswan. The president again said: I agree to the right to self-determination for the Palestinians within a few years.

AS-SADAT RECEIVES LETTER FROM PRESIDENT CARTER

NC080630Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 0005 GMT 8 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 7 January--In Aswan (?yesterday) President Muhammad Anwar as-Sadat received a letter from U.S. President Jimmy Carter connected with the efforts being exerted and the contacts being held by the U.S. President which are related to resolving the Middle East crisis. The newspaper AL-JUMHURIYAH reports that the letter was handed to President as-Sadat by U.S. Ambassador in Cairo Hermann Eilts.

U.S. CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION ARRIVES IN ASWAN

Meeting With As-Sadat

NC071555Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1422 GMT 7 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Aswan, 7 January--Before leaving for Khartoum today, President Anwar as-Sadat received a delegation of congressmen headed by Chairman of the House International Relations Committee Zablocki, which is visiting Egypt at present in the course of a tour of Middle East countries. The congressional delegation arrived in Aswan aboard a private plane [illegible] in order to meet with President as-Sadat. The delegation has visited the High Dam.

As-Sadat Statement

NC0806144Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 2300 GMT 7 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 8 January [date as received]--President Anwar as-Sadat has announced that Egypt is ready to discuss security facilities for Israel, but not at the expense of land, and that what is important is that Israel should have a new concept of peace.

In statements to journalists following his meeting with the U.S. congressional delegation in Aswan today, President as-Sadat said that so far Israel has not answered the Egyptian initiative for peace and that so far the matter is not a question of settlements as much as it is one of Israel's readiness for peace and for abandoning the principle of the forcible occupation of territory. The president added: I have announced my readiness to offer all the security guarantees Israel needs to feel secure, but not at the expense of land.

President as-Sadat said that at his meeting with the members of Congress today he asked them to stand on the side of peace based on justice. He said he has become more optimistic following the Ismailia meeting and the agreement to form the political and military committees because this signifies that the momentum for peace is continuing and that we are proceeding on a sound path. The president said that the Palestinians must gain the right to determine their own fate and that it is possible to establish some kind of relationship between the Palestinian state and Jordan .

Meeting With Mar'i

NC0816555Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1502 GMT 8 Jan 78 NC

[Excerpts] Cairo, 8 January--The People's Assembly speaker, Engineer Sayyid Mar'i, has stated that there will be no peace in the Middle East if the Palestinian problem is not solved. He added: We will speak on behalf of nobody and the Palestinians must speak for themselves.

At a meeting today with members of the U.S. congressional delegation which is currently visiting Egypt headed by Clement Zablocki, chairman of the House International Relations Committee, Sayyid Mar'i referred to Israel's establishment of eight new settlements in Sinai and the recent statements made by Israeli Prime Minister Menahem Begin and Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan on this issue by saying: This is not the appropriate time for such statements, especially since the political and military committees will begin work in the second half of this month.

Mar'i said that those who believe that the Egyptians want peace because of their economic situation are mistaken. He added: We accept peace but not at any price. We seek a durable and just peace based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and on the upholding of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

The People's Assembly speaker pointed out that Egyptian public opinion, which supported President as-Sadat's initiative, will not change unless it becomes clear that the Israelis are not serious in their search for a just peace. During his meeting with the U.S. congressional delegation, Mar'i said that the Egyptian people are wondering about the advantage of the initiative. He added that if President as-Sadat were to announce that the peace initiatives are of no use, the people would support him in this.

In his statement to the U.S. congressional delegation, the People's Assembly speaker emphasized that if the opportunity for peace in the area, the first steps of which have been taken by President as-Sadat, is missed, then the position of the United States in the area would be shaken and there would be a good opportunity for the return of the Soviet Union to the area.

Meeting With Salim

NC082004Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1830 GMT 8 Jan 78 NC

[Excerpts] Prime Minister Mamduh Salim today met with the U.S. congressional delegation headed by Clement Zablocki, chairman of the House International Relations Committee, currently visiting the Middle East to study the situation in the area.

Mamduh Salim first outlined the aims of the peace initiatives and subsequent developments. He emphasized that the initiative aims at eliminating doubts and hatred between the Arabs and Israel, which constituted a big obstacle in the peace process.

He said that the initiative aims at overcoming the effects of 30 years of military and political conflict and the destructive effect on the peoples in the area. The initiative opens the doors for establishing a just peace. The initiative can save dozens of years of conflict and creates a unique opportunity for establishing peace. It has won the support of all the peoples in the area, including the Israeli people who showed heartfelft and warm support for peace. The exception was a rejectionist minority supported by the Soviet Union whose goal is the continuation of the state of no peace, no war in the Middle East, so that the efforts of the peoples in the area may not turn to construction and progress in peace. The Soviet Union has also played a role in stirring up disturbances in Africa, particularly in the Horn of Africa by supporting Ethiopia with offensive arms against its neighbors, thus creating a dangerous situation in Africa and the Red Sea.

The prime minister noted that the Soviet Union cannot forget President as-Sadat's role in delivering Egypt from Soviet domination and in guiding the Arabs toward the achievement of a just peace in the Middle East in order to end the state of no war, no peace.

Mamduh Salim explained to the U.S. congressional delegation that the Cairo conference and the Ismailia meeting have achieved positive goals maintaining the momentum of the efforts for peace and providing an opportunity for direct negotiations for the first time between Egypt and Israel- and have clearly demonstrated Egypt's real position on establishing peace and the dimensions of the just Arab rights which have been widely supported throughout the world. Egypt, he said, had invited all parties in addition to the two cochairmen of the Geneva conference. He said that the door will remain open for all parties to take part in the conference at the appropriate time.

Mamduh Salim dealt with the question of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories and said that this constitutes an obstacle in the way of peace and violates international treaties prohibiting a change in the demographic status of the occupied territories. This also violates the UN resolutions which condemned the establishment of such settlements.

Prime Minister Salim said that in spite of the difficulties encountered in the negotiations, Egypt views the future and the establishment of peace with optimism.

Egypt will continue all efforts promoting the peace process on the basis of justice. Egypt calls upon the great powers to assume their responsibility in this matter.

A dialog followed the prime minister's outline in which a number of congressional delegation members took part, seeking clarification on all aspects related to the current situation and the Egyptian views. The prime minister answered all questions affirming the soundness of the Egyptian stand and adherence to the spirit of President as-Sadat's initiative for achieving justice and security for all parties.

SPOKESMAN CONDEMNS NEW ISRAELI SETTLEMENTS

NC071500Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1410 GMT 7 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 7 January--The Arab Republic of Egypt declared today that the persistence of the Israeli authorities in their policy of establishing settlements in the occupied territories is a continued defiance of world public opinion and a grave violation of international law and the requirements of reaching a peaceful solution.

This was contained in a statement issed by an official Foreign Ministry spokesman because of news agency reports on Israel continuing to establish settlements and on the Israeli prime minister's approval of the establishment of a number of new settlements in the Sinai Peninsula.

The statement affirms that this Israeli action is also considered a blatant disregard of the UN resolutions that have been issued in this regard, particularly the UN General Assembly resolution pertaining to the Israeli settlements issued on 26 October 1977, and the unanimous statement issued by the UN Security Council on 11 November 1976 which stipulated that the measures which are being carried out by Israel in the occupied Arab territories and which alter the demographic composition and geographical status--particularly the establishment of settlements--are measures which should be strongly condemned and that these measures have no legal basis but are an impediment to the achievement of peace.

The spokesman declared that the Government of Egypt believes that this policy absolutely does not help the current peace efforts and that it rouses suspicions about the seriousness and sincerity of the Israeli side to promote these peace efforts.

The spokesman added that Egypt reiterate that solving the Middle East issue and establishing a durable and just peace cannot be accomplished unless there is a complete Israeli withdrawal from all the territories occupied in 1967 and the Palestinian people are granted the right of self-determination.

MUBARAK REQUESTS BEGIN STATEMENT ON SETTLEMENTS

NC082253Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 2230 GMT 8 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 8 January--A responsible official source has stated that Vice President Husni Mubarak tonight contacted the U.S. ambassador in Cairo and asked him to obtain the text of Israeli Prime Minister Menahem Begin's statement concerning Israeli settlements in Sinai in order to have Begin's correct statements on Israel's stand if Egypt insists that no Israeli settlements should remain in Sinai, which in turn could compel Israel to ask for a change in the border between it and Egypt.

Husni Mubarak informed the U.S. ambassador that Egypt's stand is completely clear and that it will not accept the argument with regard to the complete withdrawal from Sinai, that giving up a single centimeter of Egyptian territory will not lead to the establishment of peace in the Middle East, and that if Mr Begin was thinking in this way then this means that he was not proceeding along the road to peace.

AL-AHRAM REPORTS PROPOSED POLITICAL COMMITTEE AGENDA

NC090618Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 2320 GMT 8 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 8 January AL-AHRAM reports in its Monday edition that Egypt has informed the United States in its capacity as a full member of the meetings of the political committee which will convene in Jerusalem on Monday, 16 January, that it suggests that the political committee agenda contain the following:

1. Complete Israeli withdrawal. Egypt has attached to this clause a complete explanation and clarification of the concept of complete withdrawal to Egypt's international borders as well as to that of every state whose territory Israel occupied on 5 June 1967.

2. The Palestine question. This clause includes granting the Palestinian people the right to self-determination and the establishment of a Palestinian state, and other aspects of the question including the right to repatriation and compensation.

3. Peace arrangements following the withdrawal.

AL-AHRAM says that Israel has suggested that the political committee agenda contain the following:

1. The Israeli settlements in occupied territories.
2. Conclusion of peace treaties with the Arab states.
3. The question of Palestinian Arabs and refugees.

AS-SADAT INTERVIEWED BY OCTOBER CHIEF EDITOR

NC081418 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1250 GMT 8 Jan 78 NC

[Text of interview granted by Egyptian President Anwar as-Sadat to OCTOBER chief editor Anis Mansur; to be published 8 January--date not given]

[Text] [Question] The Palestine question, particularly the West Bank, occupies an important place in the overall settlement with Israel. The reason, perhaps, is that the foreign television networks and newspapers have supported Israel on this issue. As a result, all the statements, clarifications and also complications are being centered on this issue--and this will take a long time. But in the flood of available information, the question of Egyptian Sinai has been overlooked. Is this because interest in the West Bank is greater, or is it because the question of Sinai is considered to have been resolved and on this premise there is no justification for discussing Sinai, despite the fact that the intense clarity which has surrounded this issue has made it unclear--exactly as when we open our eyes in the sun and perceive nothing because of its dazzling brilliance?

[Answer] This reminds us of the book written by Menahem Begin entitled "The White Nights". He chose this title because the expression "white nights" in French means the nights in which one does not sleep.

In other words, one's eyes tire to an extent that one sees everything in shades of white; that is, one sees nothing completely, as if his eyes have become all white without any black in them. But by this title, Begin meant to say that when he was captured in Russia, his cell was lit, day and night. His nights were white nominally, but black factually. The point I am trying to make is close to this meaning because there have been many clarifications and counterclarifications, and opinions and thoughts have appeared in the Arab newspapers and speculations have appeared in the Western newspapers. All these things are natural and are not alien to my calculations.

But I have frequently announced, in wide-ranging discussions, that my attitude has not changed. Total withdrawal from Sinai is a principle which will be implemented to the letter and there are no differences over this principle between Egypt and Israel. I repeat that withdrawal from Egyptian territory to the international border is a fact over which we have fully agreed--and I see no justification for concern or fear. We want peace and the whole world supports us. We do not want war and the whole world is praising this--and I mean every word I am now saying. I said that in Jerusalem and said it again in Ismailia. Israel's leaders are announcing on all occasions that I am a man of peace and that I am sincere in my quest for peace.

[Question] We do not doubt a word you say. We are speeding up the peace process and because we are doing this, when anything comes up we become apprehensive lest it obstruct the march. Some of these apprehensions have been caused by our bad opinion of the Jews, and some have been reported in the world papers. Moreover, 40 days have passed and we have not achieved anything from all this. I will give you one example which is prevalent among the military and civilians. It concerns the town of Sharm ash-Shaykh. The majority of the people do not even know its location, but they know that is Egyptian territory. This is sufficient for them to imagine that treating one inch of it lightly means treating all of Egypt lightly. Your Excellency had declared that not a single inch of Egyptian territory will be treated lightly. What is the truth in what is being said about Sharm ash-Shaykh?

[Answer] What I have said about complete withdrawal from Egyptian territory applies to Sharm ash-Shaykh as well because it is Egyptian territory. However, Sharm ash-Shaykh is an example of a number of mistakes that have been committed in Egyptian policy and in Arab policy as well. It is also an example of what we must not do today or tomorrow. After the tripartite attack on Egypt in 1956, Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir agreed that international forces whould be present in Sharm ash-Shaykh because it lies at the entrance of the Gulf of Aqaba and from Sharm ash-Shaykh navigation could be controlled and the Israeli ships traveling to the port of Elat from the Red Sea could be prevented from doing so. But I do not know why Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir did this, and I did not ask him at the time, although the Gulf of Aqaba is an international strait on which Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Israel lie.

Sharm ash-Shaykh was the black spot on the white robe worn by 'Abd an-Nasir. Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir was a leader and one of the Arab nation's heroes. He challenged the major states, confronted the tripartite attack and triumphed over Britain and France--the two states which emerged victorious at the end of World War II.

But Israel sneaked in under the cover provided by the wings of Britain and France and penetrated our territory to fulfill its historic dreams of expansion and to achieve security by deploying its forces outside its own territory. Up to now, Israel has not fought on its territory. In all the wars it has fought, Israel has always been far away from its people and territory. The Egyptian hero, 'Abd an-Nasir, had triumphed over the major states and Israel except in the case of Sharm ash-Shaykh which was part of his territory but not under his control.

People with evil tongues in Iraq and Syria--and even in Saudi Arabia--criticized 'Abd an-Nasir at that time. It was said at the time that Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir who is calling for the liberation of other territories is incapable of liberating his own territory.

There were new leaders in the Orient who were the proteges of the Soviet Union. There was the Soviet Union's golden boy and rising star, Salah Jadid, with whom they tried to strike Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir but failed just as they failed in their attempt to make 'Abd al-Karim Qasim, the mad Iraqi leader--who was as mad as Al-Qadhdhafi is today--a hero and a giant who would dwarf the other leaders, especially Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir. It was certain that Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir was using the card of the Palestinian issue and he succeeded in this completely.

Some historians say that he used this card to strike the regimes in the area and that he used such words as progressive, reactionary, royalist and republican. These are the same words which the Ba'th Party is still using with deep gratitude for Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir and the Soviets as well, although gratitude is not one of the characteristics of the Ba'th Party in Syria or in Iraq.

The story of Sharm ash-Shaykh always bothered 'Abd an-Nasir. I remember when I was in Moscow at the head of a parliamentary delegation in May 1967 I met with Semenov, who was a deputy foreign minister and member of the Political Bureau at the time and who was more important than Gromyko, who became a member of the Political Bureau only 3 years ago.

Semenov told me that the Jews had massed 11 armored brigades to invade Syria in reply to the escalating fedayeen operations. The then prime minister, Eshkol, announced that if the fedayeen did not cease their activities, he would march on Damascus.

I then told Semenov that Salah Jadid, the Soviets' pampered child, was not worth his weight in sand and that it was Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir and Egypt who really carried weight, because no decision could be made except by Egypt; that they would lose the bet they put on this frail horse called Salah Jadid; and that they always chose the losing side because of their misunderstanding and because they always wanted to play one leader against the other. Semenov was a friend and I do not know where he is now, whether he is dead or alive or working as the director of a railroad station as is the practice in Russia with those who fall in disfavor.

'Abd al-Hakim 'Amir was in Pakistan and he sent Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir the famous cable: "Close the straits." 'Abd al-Hakim 'Amir meant that Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir should close the Tiran Straits and thus the Gulf of Aqaba would be closed to the Israeli ships navigating the sea up and down the gulf.

At that time, Egypt had prepared itself militarily, pushed its forces into Sinai, and the whole world watched what would happen. Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir knew that the Egyptian soldier ranked next to the U.S. soldier as far as weapons were concerned--that is in the number of arms he carried. The difference, naturally, was in the way these arms were used.

At that time, Israel was in an unprecedented state of fear. It is enough for you to read what the Israeli defense minister, 'Ezer Weizman, has written. It is an indescribable picture of fear and confusion.

However, what Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir wanted was to affirm that he was "the man" who was capable, who made decisions, who was the liberator, and that he was the leader. He also thought that that was the opportunity for him to end Israel's mad dreams, particularly since Golda Meir had announced in 1956 the Sinai's final annexation to Israel as a phase of the emergence of greater Israel. He also thought that that was another opportunity to make Israel realize its real size.

After that 'Abd an-Nasir asked the UN forces stationed at Sharm ash-Shaykh to immediately withdraw--and these forces withdrew. This incident later created problems between us and Israel--and they were still mentioning this incident at the Ismailia meeting.

Furthermore, Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir wanted to defy President Johnson who had cut off aid to Egypt in yielding to Zionist pressures after Johnson had sought the help of the Rostow brothers, one of whom was at the State Department while the other was at the United Nations. Johnson also sought the help of Arthur Goldberg--and the three men were Zionists. In other words, Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir wanted to hit all the birds with one stone.

Then the 1967 war broke out and Sharm ash-Shaykh and all of Sinai were lost. The UNEF was no longer there, but there were Israeli occupation forces. The Jews announced that Israel, which was born to stay, would stay in order to expand limitlessly.

At that time, they upheld Ben-Gurion's famous slogan that Israeli territory was all the territory were Israeli soliders were stationed. In every Israeli solider's pocket was another slogan: Whatever your eye beholds should be yours. Therefore, the 1967 war whetted the appetite of all of Israel, which wanted to swallow up the Arab land from the Tigris to the Euphrates.

[Question] The Israeli defense minister, 'Ezer Weizman, told me in the presence of Prime Minister Mamduh Salim and War and War Production Minister Gen al-Jamasi that he personally believes that Sharm ash-Shaykh is of no importance now, that the people in Israel have another view, and that we do not know what took place regarding the Sharm ash-Shaykh "incident." Are the Jews still apprehensive that we will again close the Tiran Strait and blockade navigation to and from the Israeli port of Elat, and how has it been possible to convince them that this will not happen?

[Answer] The Sharm ash-Shaykh incident was discussed. The Jews are excused to a large extent. They are saying we believe you and recognize you as a man who honors his word but what are we going to do if the man who comes after you assumes a stand similar to that of Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir? Who will guarantee this will not happen?

My answer to that was that Sharm ash-Shaykh is Egyptian and that there was no doubt or controversy about it and that you have to choose between including an article in the peace agreement stipulating that the Gulf of Aqaba is an international waterway guaranteed by the UN Security Council and it is similar to Bab el Mandeb, Gibraltar and the Bosporus--such waterways are controlled by recognized international agreements and the Gulf of Aqaba is in fact an international waterway because Israel and three Arab states border on it and I fully approve of this--or that UN emergency forces be deployed at Sharm ash-Shaykh and that there should not be one single Israeli among them. I told the Israelis: Choose what suits you because I do not intend to go back to war and I want peace for myself, for you and for the world. But such a peace must not be brought about at the expense of Egyptian sovereignty or at the expense of one inch of Egyptian territory, and this is a self-evident truth over which I do not accept any argument.

Moreover, the Jews have turned Sharm ash-Shakykh into a tourist port and have built hotels there and paved the roads to it right up to Elat.

The Israelis said that no one had dared to demand [possession of] Sharm ash-Shaykh or the coastal road in 1967. However, after the 1973 war this port had no value because in the 1973 war we closed the entire Red Sea to them right from Bab el Mandeb and we blew up one of their ships without saying anything about it. Israel on its part announced that it had closed the port of Elat. Thus, what had Sharm ash-Shaykh done for Israel at that time? Nothing, and therefore what Weizman had said was correct.

However, the ordinary Jews are generally afraid of withdrawing back into their territory because they have grown accustomed to fighting outside their territory, because their country is narrow and has no depth, and because their country is surrounded by neighbors who are always lying in wait for it.

This fear of the Jews is historical and they are helpless about it. The Jews have lived in danger in all the states and the cities. This is why they secluded themselves in the Jewish ghettos and locked themselves up in these ghettos. Even when they went to Israel, they made it a large "ghetto" within which they lived in fear. It is this fear which induced them to hate others, because others were the source of fear. In other words, it was the others who had stripped Jewish hearts of a feeling of security and reassurance. It is for this reason that to them peace is real and their belief in it is real. But their tragedy is that they believe nobody and doubt all intentions. Therefore, this suspicion has deprived them of achieving their hopes and dreams.

The Jews boast that their new generations are Sabras. This word means the cactus apple which grows in the desert. The Jews try to find a meaning for this word saying that on the outside the cactus is thorny, while the inside of it is soft. However, the truth is that the Jews are indeed like the cactus apple, but with one difference: Its thorns have turned inward, because thorns and suspicions are the most important traits of the Israeli citizen.

This is one of the problems faced by all those who negotiate with the Jews. I believe that my initiative in going to Jerusalem has transgressed this phase and has drawn thorns, suspicions and bad thoughts a little farther from the heart of the Israeli citizen.

What I have seen of their people and their spontaneity in the streets has been enough for me. What I have seen of the world Jewry and from the whole world is also enough for me.

[Question] Therefore, a number of Jews still believe that the return of Sharm ash-Shaykh to Egypt endangers all of Israel. Even worse, perhaps this idea has magnified this fear and people have appeared in Israel who oppose the principle of withdrawing from the territory occupied after 1967. Doesn't this present obstacles to the steps taken toward a comprehensive peace?

[Answer] I do not see this, but there are trends in Israel, such as those of their parties and governments. Even before Menahem Begin came to Ismailia, the Gush Emunim group--the group of believers, an extremist religious minority--shouted outside his house throughout the night so that the man would not sleep. They (?arrested) them, but this group has remained infuriated by all the peace agreements. There are others who demonstrated against the Israeli Government because it decided to withdraw from the West Bank.

Since we do not fear these demonstrations, they will not prevent us from achieving peace for all the people, even for those who demonstate against peace. This is so because it is no longer possible for anyone to stop us and our people can no longer wait for long, because world pressure is now at its strongest level.

[Question] Therefore, where did the idea of leasing or lending Sharm ash-Shakykh come from? It has been said that this would be done for a period of 10 or 20 years, particularly concerning that paved coastal road extending from Sharm ash-Shaykh northward to Elat harbor.

[Answer] Those who object to the return of Sharm ash-Shaykh to Egypt must have chosen for themselves a solution which is a compromise between returning it and lending it. Their imagination has led them to believe that they can rent it furnished from Egypt. They cited as examples the lend-lease agreements between the United States and Britain which were concluded to fight a third party. But we want to achieve peace, not war. Furthermore, and as a point of principle, we reject leasing or lending Sharm ash-Shaykh to anybody, for any reason, at any time.

In his memoirs, Ben-Gurion relates that he drove his car toward Sharm ash-Shaykh. Then he asked the driver to turn in another direction. Ben-Gurion found a number of Jews plowing the land and they had set up a number of tents. He asked them: What are you doing? They said: A group of our ancestors lived here some 3,000 years ago. Ben-Gurion asked them: Is it possible for anyone to live in this hot climate and this dry desert? They answered: If our ancestors lived here, why shouldn't we live here?

Ben-Gurion also says that throughout his life he had not read about or heard of Jewish tribes with this name. But there is no objection to the Jews going ahead and reclaiming the desert.

[Question] Do you believe that this Sharm ash-Shaykh incident was unnecessary? In other words, was there any justification for Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir to start a war because of it? Therefore, how could it have been possible for him to avert the war without finding himself compelled to expel the emergency forces from Sharm ash-Shaykh?

[Answer] The 1967 war broke out for several reasons. The Arabs began a war that was not called for. They harassed Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir considerably because of Sharm ash-Shaykh. These inter-Arab fights are the card which the Jews use and they always win with it. The Jews play, encourage and wait for inter-Arab differences. By so doing, we give the Jews the rope with which we hang ourselves. They wait and see, while we play into their hands through all our defects and weaknesses.

It was also Ben-Gurion who said that Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir had committed a great mistake when he changed Egypt's name, an ancient 7,000-year-old-name; that it was Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir who had taken Egypt from being subservient to Britain to being subservient to Russia; and that it was Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir who had exhausted his people's strength because he made gold dust turn into sand, instead of making sand turn into gold dust.

Ben-Gurion did not pity Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir or Egypt. However, Ben-Gurion wanted to accuse 'Abd an-Nasir of being the man who antagonized his own people and the Arab peoples and who exhausted everybody.

In Ben-Gurion's memoirs there are little examples which he cites for the Jewish people. However, these examples fully agree with what I have said; that the Jews have benefited from our mistakes. Ben-Gurion says: The Arab attack on Jaffa in 1921 made the Jews transform the outskirts of Tel Aviv into an independent city. Furthermore, the strikes staged by the Arab workers in 1921, 1929 and 1933 made the Jews work with their own hands. The Jews had despised manual work and left it for the Arab workers. These strikes also induced the Jews to organize trade unions and workers parties.

In his book "Ben-Gurion Looks Backward," Ben-Gurion also says: Had the Arabs accepted the partition scheme in 1947, they would have made Israel smaller in area than it is at present. Thank God that the Arabs said no. There are other examples, but we do not learn from our mistakes. In other words, we do not read history and we also disagree with history. For this reason, Moshe Dayan was not mistaken when he announced--out of intense conceit--that he could fight Egypt the same way he had fought us in 1956 and 1967 and still triumph over us.

He means that we do not benefit from our experiences and that we are forgetful. We forget our mistakes because we dislike being ashamed of ourselves, although it is imperative for us to know in which pitfall we have fallen so that we will not fall again into a deeper pitfall and suffer yet greater losses.

On this occasion, I recall a little incident which I heard about while I was at the command post in 1967. A MIG-21 had entered Israeli airspace to take pictures of the Israeli positions. The plane returned, landed, and was chased by Israeli planes 13 minutes later. This is a very long and unusual period of time for Israeli planes to appear and give chase to a hostile plane. But the Jews knew all our planes as well as all our bases, and they wanted to mislead and deceive us--and they successfully achieved this.

I return to the mistakes committed by 'Abd al-Hakim 'Amir and Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir's hesitation. We had asked that the then air force commander, who had been in this post for 11 years, be relieved. But Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir failed to budge 'Abd al-Hakim 'Amir one inch from his position and thus the air force disaster occurred in 1967. It was the climax of the accumulations of errors, misjudgments, ignorance and indifference.

[Question] It has been reported that Israel has settlements in Egyptian territory. These settlements are merely buildings, farms, factories, arsenals and settlers by the hundreds--and sometimes by the thousands--and they come from various nations. It has also been said that Israel will not give up these settlements, but will maintain them and also their residents. It has been said that Israel will also not abandon its sons, but will protect them with military force and, reportedly, with police and with men of religion and that they will all be subject to Israeli law. All this is totally in conflict with Egypt's full sovereignty over its land, what is on its land, and those who are on this land.

[Answer] This is another one of the "trial balloons" sent up by Israel or by its political or religious parties. Israel sets up numerous settlements within its territory and on its border--religious settlements, party settlements, private settlements and military settlements. They have many reasons for establishing these settlements in these forms. They own land for the first time in their history. They also feel for the first time in their history that they are the majority. They are plowing the land or doing manual work for the first time. The reason is that in all the countries they have lived, fear induced them not to own land but to possess ships and gold so that if they were expelled or if they escaped their movement would be easier.

Furthermore, the Jews in these settlements are trying to achieve complete equality among themselves, because they have lived under difficult circumstances and experienced class, color and religious differences. There are numerous other reasons, the most important of which is that these settlements are really advanced military positions--and this is an explanation, not a justification, of their behavior.

On Egyptian land north of Al-'Arish there are settlements and there is an airport at (Ash-Shaykh Zuwayd), and this leads to Beersheba. There are also settlements near Rafah. There is the Palestinian Rafah and the Egyptian Rafah, and a street separating the two. In other words, there is an imaginary border between them. All I remember of Rafah from the time I lived there in 1951 is that it was a shantytown, and I do not know what has become of it now. The Yamit settlement was set up near Rafah. Yamit is a harbor on the Mediterranean.

Regardless of the number of these settlements, I am absolutely not interested in this matter. Why? Because I have told Israel's leaders: I am aware of your need for security. This is why I have come to discuss security in general with you. I will achieve it for you because I want peace. I know that these settlements are warning stations and an early defense system--and I am confident about all these things.

I also know that the Bar-Lev line was something of this kind. And where has it gone now? As I have said, the Bar-Lev line consisted of bastions set up by fear on behalf of hatred. The same thing also holds true for all these settlements. As long as we are going to sit together--and we have already sat together and within a few days the members of the political and military committees will sit together with the same aim; the achievement of security--there is no meaning at all in us discussing these partial issues; the issue of the settlements.

Despite the fact that this is a partial issue, I affirm as of now that I do not accept the presence of a single Israeli settlement on my land.

Let them demolish them. I also do not accept the presence of a single Israeli, whether civilian or military. I have decided on this matter completely and have finished with it.

Before my Jerusalem initiative, a philosophy emerged that went like this: Why shouldn't the Israelis remain in their settlements? They are foreigners. Aren't there foreigners of all nations in Egypt? Why doesn't Egypt consider those Israelis as foreigners as well? This philosophy is completely rejected. It emerged before my initiative. After my initiative the picture changed completely: Israel's attempt to turn the strategic borders into political borders is no longer acceptable. In other words, Israel's so-called secure borders are no longer secure. Egypt has missiles with a range of 300 kilometers. These missiles are on the west bank of the canal. When the Israeli forces entered [the west bank of the canal] through the bulge, they shelled the bases of these missiles which can hit anywhere in Israel. Is Israel also to occupy the west bank of the canal so that these missiles will not hit it?

Though logical, this question might seem strange. But there are some people in Israel who see it as neither strange nor logical but as historical fact. History tells them that the Jews came to Egypt with the Hyksos and settled in Ash-Shariquyah Governorate and, it is said, in the land of Goshen--Al-Jizah Governorate. On this basis, they would demand this land as well.

However, this old picture no longer exists in our civilized world or on the table of negotiations between civilized people. They are civilized because they have primarily agreed on a number of political and humanitarian facts: peace, respect for all sides, reverence for life for the sake of the generations that are to follow and repudiation of distrust which is generated by fear which is generated by hatred which is "the legitimate mother" of all wars.

[Question] We need a long time to eliminate the vestiges of generations of distrust, misjudgment and doubt. If the initiative has changed the course of events, it has not changed the nature of events. This needs a long time. Your Excellency has said that a war was about to break out between Israel and us because of the maneuvers staged by General al-Jamasi, which prompted some Israeli leaders to say that your initiative was a new trick. Is there any truth in what the world press said--that they expected your plane to land at Ben-Gurion Airport without you being on it but that a number of Egyptian shock troops would emerge? How true is this terrible picture?

[Answer] I do not know exactly. They were the ones who believed--also because of distrust and deep doubt--that I would not go to Jerusalem but that I would send 120 shock troops and that when the plane landed and its doors opened, the shock troops would emerge and open fire on all the Israeli leaders who stood in a line waiting for me. This is why the Jews had deployed over 1,000 sharpshooters equipped with machineguns at Ben-Gurion Airport ready to blow up the plane together with the shock troops in seconds. I have also heard something else that I have not yet ascertained the truth of but which is also consistent with distrust--that the band that stood at the airport also had weapons. This is strange. However, I did not notice anything. The situation was too great and too magnificent for such things to worry me. However, it was the press which published this police scenario.

In Jewish literature and art, it is fear that causes miracles. It suffices for an educated man to refer to what had been written by their literary figures such as Kafka, Werfel, Zweig, Heine, Basheva Singer and others or even to read what had been written by the great psychoanalyst Freud, to find out that their hearts are filled with fear and terror. Those who have seen the paintings by artist Marc Chagall will discover that they are outcries in color. The Jews also continue to set up enormous museums of sadness and grief. In Jerusalem, I saw the building which they call Yad Vasham, or the museum of the catastrophe and heroism. All of it consists of pictures depicting sadness and sorrow, fear and a feeling of insecurity.

Therefore, I do not exclude the possibility of this terrible picture occurring to a military man or a politician--an idea that cannot possibly occur to a man like me who does not seek death, orphanhood or bloodshed. I do not want to see young men in the prime of their youth sitting in wheelchairs pushing themselves with their hands until they die. Such a picture combines national heroism and noble pain.

[Question] It has also been said that Israel possesses airfields on our territory near its borders, and that if the Israelis abandon the settlements, they will hold onto the airfields. Is this true?

[Answer] This is not true. It is not strategically or militarily a good thing to put my aircraft on airfields in the territory of others. And if these airfields were left to me, I would not be able to benefit from them because our [the Egyptians and Israelis] mistake would be the same. Their airfields and aircraft would be within my reach, and our airfieds and aircraft would be within their reach. The existence of airfields and settlements is completely rejected. Therefore, when I was asked what should be done with these airfields, I replied: Plow them over before you leave.

[Question] Do the Jews have a right to ask Egypt for compensation for the installations they established on our land?

[Answer] Let them ask. We, too, shall ask the same from them. The result will be that Israel will find itself in debt--up to its neck in debt. The important thing is for us to sit down and discuss. They have been catching fish from Bardawil Lake and exporting it in cans. It is known that Bardawil is Egyptian. But they are marketing and selling Egyptian products after canning them in factories. We will regain these factories completely intact, just as the oilfields in Abu Rudays were returned to us completely intact.

Accepting the principle of negotiations does not mean that we must be lenient. It means removing all the obstacles that stand in the way of another greater and more splendid aim: peace. Peace can only be achieved through a comprehensive settlement, by calling a spade a spade, and by knowing the size of the issues. This is possible only if the vision is clear and if we have honesty and courage. Lying and concealment are no longer a method of government. Everything we say or do, everything we announce or reject is shown on the screens of 1 billion television sets. The praise I heard from President Carter at Aswan Airport embarrassed me. I only did what my duty and conscience dictated. Success comes from God and support comes from the people. Thank God whom I have pleased and Who thus has pleased me with the love of the millions of my people and the love of all those who look forward to living in peace.

[Question] After your great achievements in Egypt--liquidation of the centers of power, the May Revolution, the October victories, the supremacy of the law, the freedom of the press, the economic open-door policy, the invasion of the desert, and widening the narrow valley for the people of Egypt--you have declared that this is sufficient and that you have achieved all that you wished, and that future generations must go further and choose the type of life and forms of peaceful coexistence that they consider suitable for them. However, by your recent initiative you went ahead of this generation and the next. How do you see the future of Egypt?

[Answer] I visualized Egypt in the year 2000 and prepared a studied program for that. I embarked on cultivating the desert and opened the door to Arab and foreign capital and offered all the guarantees that a civilized state can offer--and Egypt is a civilized state. However, I admit--and this is not out of humility--that my initiative produced much greater results than I imagined. What I hear and read of statements by world leaders about the effects of this initiative on this age and on the future generations has exceeded my imagination. The method of the whole world in looking at things has changed, and this will lead to a comprehensive change in human relations. Prosperity will be achieved in the Middle East, and future generations will have a better life than we have.

Thr real reason for this initiative was that I saw that future generations will be worse off from beginning to end. When I looked at the course of political events in the Arab world I found its beginning to be regret and its end to be an empty void. The regret is because we have lived through all these wars up to the October victory, which achieved dignity for us, and have not achieved prosperity yet because we are still spending on arms. The void is because if we go on carrying arms and do not stop senseless talk we will not move one step forward, but will remain in a frozen state until we die.

Keeping silent about this tragedy is a crime against an innocent generation. Half of the population of Egypt is below the age of 20. They have not lived the calamities of Egypt, although it is a national duty for them to know and study them. Therefore, it is not necessary to grind them in war or destroy them for fear of war and thus create an impotent, paralyzed generation that hestitates to make decisions and thus becomes the prey of agents of sabotage and false advocates of peace. For this reason I took my initiative. I again thank Almighty God who granted me patience and calm before my people. I ask God to give me strength to dedicate my life to Him.

[Question] I return once more to the principle of total withdrawal from Sinai. Your Excellency has rejected the word "concessions," which Israel uses when we speak of withdrawal. You said that Israel cedes nothing it owns. It returns to us what we had owned. But when Israel stopped using this word to some extent, it replaced it with another word: the guarantees. Therefore, what are the guarantees sought by Israel so that it would go ahead in the peace process, and will this withdrawal be achieved by widely separated phases?

[Answer] The Israeli plan which was submitted to us in Ismailia calls for withdrawal in two phases and for having demilitarized territory only on the Egyptian side. We believe that the demilitarized territory should be on both sides, and that we should take into account the difference in territorial depth between Israel and Sinai [as heard].

We will bear in mind that the width of the demilitarized territory on the Egyptian side should be slightly greater because Israel has no depth.

There will also be early warning stations, like the present stations, on condition that not a single Israeli will be present in any of these stations. There will also be limited-armament territory. In other words, the arms present there will be machineguns and light armored cars. This is despite the fact that we have another viewpoint: that the withdrawal should be from east of Al-'Arish to Ra's an-Naqab near Elat. This would tend to annull "the talk about" Sharm ash-Shaykh and the other settlements.

Phase one will be the withdrawal to behind the line extending from east of Al-'Arish to the west of Ra's Muhammad, while phase two will be the withdrawal to the international borders. There will also be political guarantees, although the shortcoming of these guarantees is the fact that they will compel us to introduce foreign states into the area. But there will be no objection if these guarantees will be given by the five big states, as was stipulated in my first initiative; that is, with a guarantee by the Security Council.

The Jews have undergone an experience which they will not forget. We will not forget it either. In 1951, the United States, Britain and France guaranteed Israel's border. But that was a funny thing because these states provided guarantees only to Israel. If Israel attacked us, it would have been said that Israel was defending itself. And if we defended ourselves, it would have been said that we were attacking Israel. These states also guaranteed at the same time to give Israel air cover if it were attacked.

[Question] How much time you estimate will be required for a total withdrawal?

[Answer] They say from 3 to 5 years. But I believe that 3 years is an exaggerated figure.

[Question] And afterward?

[Answer] After that and before that we must enlist all our power to build and construct Egypt and do justice to many groups of people. "Our battle" of construction is difficult but, under the aegis of peace and security, it will be more splendid and more lasting.

AS-SADAT TO MEET CALLAGHAN IN ASWAN 13 JAN

NC081442Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1428 GMT 8 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Aswan, 8 January--Vice President Muhammad Husni Mubarak today said that President Anwar as-Sadat will meet with British Prime Minister James Callaghan in Aswan on Friday for discussions about the Middle East crisis.

The vice president said that the British prime minnister will arrive in Aswan Friday afternoon on his return to London from New Delhi. Callaghan is expected to stay in Aswan several hours.

HUSAYN RECEIVES PALESTINIAN REJECTIONIST LEADERS

JN070931Y Baghdad INA in Arabic 0830 GMT 7 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Baghdad, 7 January--Saddam Husayn, assistant secretary general of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party, discussed the current situation in the area with the secretaries general of the Palestinian rejectionist organizations. During a meeting here last night between Saddam Husayn and the secretaries general of the rejectionist organizations, all aspects of the Arab situation and the efforts needed at the current stage to foil the imperialist-Zionist schemes and to stop the state of deterioration were discussed.

Saddam Husayn reviewed Iraq's firm and principled stand toward the situation in the Arab area and the plots aimed at liquidating the Palestine issue. He stressed the need to pool all resources and to make use of time in the interests of the central aim of liberating the occupied Arab land.

The meeting was attended by Tariq 'Aziz, member of the Ba'th Party National Command and of the Revolution Command Council, and 'Abd al-Husayn Musallam, head of the Palestine and Armed Struggle Office in the Ba'th Party National Command. Representing the rejectionist organizations were Dr George Habash, secretary general of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine [PFLP]; Dr Samir Ghawshah, secretary of the rejectionist front and secretary general of the Palestinian Popular Front; 'Abd ar-Rahim Ahmad, secretary of the Arab Liberation Front; and Tal'at Ya'qub, secretary general of the Palestinian Liberation Front.

The secretaries general of the rejectionist front are visiting Iraq to hold contacts with the leadership of the party and revolution in Iraq on the current Arab situation.

Habash Calls for Arab Front

JN081500Y Baghdad INA in Arabic 1040 GMT 8 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Baghdad, 8 January--Dr George Habash, secretary general of the PFLP, has affirmed that Iraq considers the subject of establishing a progressive Arab front a very serious matter. He added that, in light of its viewpoint, Iraq is determined to continue dialog and work with all Arab sides of this front in order to reate conditions that will make the establishment of this front a serious and responsible step in the face of As-Sadat's treasonable step and all the capitulatory plots.

Dr George Habash, who concluded a 4-day visit to Iraq today, held talks with officials in the National Command of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party and dealt with all aspects of the Arab political situation following As-Sadat's treacherous step and its serious repercussions.

In a press statement prior to his departure, Dr Habash said: The struggling tasks which we and all the Arab progressive forces are shouldering at this stage have become clearly defined for us all. The task of setting up an active and progressive Arab front will not be an easy one, but the efforts being exerted with all progressive parties will overcome the obstacles which impede the establishment of the front.

Dr Habash added that this front will not only foil As-Sadat's plots but will also open a new path of struggle for the masses of the Arab nation. On this path it will use all its powers and potentials for the purpose of achieving aims.

Dr Habash then expressed his gratitude to the political command of the party and revolution in Iraq, saying: I thank the party's comrades and the officials in fraternal Iraq for giving us a big chance for detailed, accurate and responsible interaction regarding all matters related to the Palestinian revolution and the Arab revolution.

He added: The masses of our Palestinian people, who feel today that their revolution and issue are passing through the most critical and serious stage, look on the masses of our people in Iraq and their progressive political leadership with great hope for pooling all the big resources of our country and people in support of the Palestinian people's revolution and all the progressive forces so that we can all confront As-Sadat's disasterous step and achieve all the legitimate aims of the masses for unity, democracy, progress and liberation of all the Palestinian Arab soil.

BA'THIST-LEBANESE NATIONALIST TALKS BEGIN IN BAGHDAD

JN071525Y Baghdad INA in Arabic 1450 GMT 7 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Baghdad, 7 January--Political talks between a delegation of the Ba'th Party under Shibli al-'Aysami, assistant secretary general, and a delegation representing the Central Council of the Leganese nationalist movement began here today. The Central Council's delegation comprises George Hawi, Muhsin Ibrahim, Radi Farhat and Tahsin al-Atrash.

The talks dealt with the relations of struggle between the Ba'th Party and the Lebanese nationalist movement, the situation in Lebanon and the need to unify the potentials and resources of the Arab progressive forces in accordance with a joint program of struggle aimed at providing the requisities to confront effectively the imperialist-Zionist-reactionary schemes and the capitulatory policies.

The two sides stressed their eagerness to preserve Lebanon's Arabism and unity, to protect southern Lebanon against the Zionist ambitions, to insure stability in the south based on the joint interests of all its sons and to set up fraternal relations with the Palestinian resistance.

The Ba'th Party asserted its support for the initiative of the Lebanese nationalist movement calling for achieving national accord in Lebanon in accord with the aforementioned bases.

HUSAYN CABLES CONGRATULATIONS TO TURKEY'S ECEVIT

JN071540Y Baghdad Domestic Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 7 Jan 78 JN

[Text] RCC Vice Chairman Saddam Husayn has sent a cable of congratulations to Mr Bulent Ecevit on his assumption of the office of the prime minister of the Turkish Republic. The following is the text of the cable:

His Excellency Bulent Ecevit, prime minister of the Turkish Republic: It gives me great pleasure to send you my warmest wishes on your assumption of the office of the prime minister of Turkey. I wish you lasting happiness and good health and to the friendly people of Turkey continued prosperity. I also hope for greater progress concerning relations between our two neighborly countries.

[Signed] Saddam Husayn, RCC vice chairman.

HUSAYN SENDS MESSAGE TO AL-ASAD ON TEHERAN TALKS

JN071625Y Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 7 Jan 78 JN

[Text] His Majesty King Husayn has sent a message to Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad on the latest developments in the Middle East problem and the outcome of his majesty's recent talks in Teheran with His Majesty The Shahanshah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi and U.S. President Jimmy Carter. The message was conveyed to President al-Asad by Jordanian Ambassador in Damascus Nabih an-Nam-.

HUSAYN WOULD VISIT EGYPT 'UNDER APPROPRIATE CIRCUMSTANCES'

JN090917Y Amman AD-DUSTUR in Arabic 9 Jan 78 pp 1, 15 JN

[Text] Cairo, agencies--President Anwar as-Sadat has extended an official invitation to His Majesty King Husayn to visit Egypt.

AD-DUSTUR has learned from its own sources that His Majesty King Husayn always welcomes visits to Egypt and meetings with President as-Sadat. However, due to the continuing contacts between the two countries concerning the Middle East peace issue, and since nothing new has developed on the Israeli stand that would enable Jordan and the other parties to participate in the process of achieving peace based on full Israeli withdrawal from the Arab territories and the guarantee of the right of the Palestinian people to determine their future, a meeting between his majesty the king and President as-Sadat will take place under the appropriate circumstances and when positive developments in the situation justify such a meeting.

ALGERIAN PRESIDENT BOUMEDIENE TO ARRIVE 10 JAN

JN081612Y Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 8 Jan 78 JN

[Text] A responsible source in the Royal Hashemite Court has stated that His Excellency Houari Boumediene, president of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, will pay a 1-day visit to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan on Tuesday, the day after tomorrow. He will hold talks with His Majesty King Husayn and Jordanian officials on the current Arab situation and recent developments in the region. The talks will also deal with relations between the two fraternal states.

JORDAN TIMES: CARTER'S REMARKS ON PALESTINIANS 'HASTY'

JN080815Y Amman JORDAN TIMES in English 8 Jan 78 p 2 JN

[Editorial: "A Case of Running Before Walking"]

[Text] President Carter's latest statements about his opposition to the creation of an independent Palestinian state in the occupied West Bank and Gaza will elicit much criticism from many quarters, both inside and outside the Arab world. It would be caught in the Zionist-inspired trap of haggling over what precise politico-administrative units are to be erected in those occupied Palestinian territories when one's main efforts should be directed at making them UN-occupied territories. We think Mr Carter's suggestions are a bit hasty, in that the breadth of his intellectual, political and moral concern in the matter is being unnecessarily dissipated by talking about hypothetical future political configurations when the Arab world and, indeed, the entire world, looks to him to muster up the intellectual, political and moral fortitude to help end the Israeli occupation of Palestinian soil.

Nobody knows what will happen in the occupied territories if and when they are returned to Arab sovereignty. And whatever does happen will be, in any case, an Arab decision, to be made on the basis of a genuine process of self-determination by those 3 million people who call themselves Palestinians. For Mr Carter to suggest that this or that national unit is inappropriate because of this or that reason is, one thinks, premature at best. The bogeyman of Arab racidalism in a free and self-determinate Palestinian national unit is only the most recent of a string of Zionist-inspired scare-tactics whose only value is that they help the world better understand the full intensity of Zionism's fundamental inability to accept the reality of Palestinian national sentiment. Mr Carter does himself and his nation a disservice by echoing the basest fears of an already fearfully base Zionist ideology whose driving force for the past three-quarters of a century has been the giant lie that the Palestinian people do not exist.

The Arabs look to the United States and the new American President to help redress the injustices of the past, not to perpetuate them. The pressing top-priority item on this agenda is to end the Israeli occupation.

AD-DUSTUR CRITICIZES ISRAELI SETTLEMENTS, U.S. STAND

JN070917Y Amman AD-DUSTUR in Arabic 7 Jan 78 pp 1, 13 JN

[Editorial: "Why This Silence Over the Issue of the Colonies?"]

[Excerpts] It is no longer acceptable for cooperation to continue between Egypt and Israel in a search for peace in the area while Israel continues its plans for more colonies on Arab land in Rafah and Sharm ash-Shaykh in addition to establishing settlements on the West Bank and the Golan. Israel cannot and must not be allowed to adopt a two-faced policy. Israel must either recognize or not recognize that these are Arab lands which must be returned to the owners within the framework of a peace treaty and that no colonies which impede negotiations for a settlement can exist there. Establishing colonies on these lands appears to be the behavior of someone doing what he wants with his own property. This being the case, the Arab negotiators must stop deceiving themselves, reassess the Israeli stand in light of this fact and act on the basis of this reassessment.

The malicious Israeli plan to establish colonies on Arab land has never been condemned and denounced internationally ever since Israel began to apply it. However, we must admit that "the U.S." reaction "in particular" was not over the degree of this ugly action. The U.S. stand toward this issue was limited to censure and exchanging memorandums. The U.S. reaction never reached the point of threats or strong denunciation, both of which could have put an end to the game of annexing Arab land gradually under the cover of settlements.

The Arab negotiators can make the issue of the Israeli colonies--we do not say settlements--a touchstone for Israeli intentions regarding peace. They can immediately ask that the establishment of these colonies be stopped as proof that Israel is ready to return the Arab territories within the framework of a comprehensive peace agreement. Should Israel reject this, its rejection would be clear proof that Israel wants peace and land together. In that case we see no use in continuing the dialog.

INFORMATION MINISTER LEAVES FOR SAUDI ARABIA

JN081504Y Amman JNA in Arabic 1430 GMT 8 Jan 78 JN

[Excerpt] Amman, 8 January--Information Minister 'Adnan Abu 'Awdah today left Amman for Riyadh for an official 3-day visit to Saudi Arabia.

AL-ASAD MEETS WITH U.S. CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

JN061700Y Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1615 GMT 6 Jan 78 JN

[Text] His Excellency President Hafiz al-Asad at 1100 today received the U.S. congressional delegation led by Clement Zablocki, chairman of the International Relations Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. The meeting was attended by Dr Muhsin Bilal, chairman of the Arab and Foreign Relations Committee of the People's Assembly, and U.S. Ambassador in Damascus Richard Murphy.

The head and members of the delegation expressed their happiness at visiting Syria, affirming that their talks with officials and members of the People's Assembly were beneficial. As a result of this visit, they have gained a deeper impression and better understanding of the means for achieving peace in the area.

His excellency the president expressed his readiness to answer questions. The questions dealt with the situation in the Middle East and relations between Syria and the United States.

His excellency the president explained Syria's stand, stressing that a just peace cannot be established without the presence of all its elements, the foremost being total Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories and recognition of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination and establishment of a Palestinian state.

The president explained that As-Sadat's visit to occupied Jerusalem had wrecked peace efforts at a time when these efforts were continuing and at a time when efforts were being exerted to overcome obstacles. He said that the Arab masses view As-Sadat's visit as a humiliating one. This feeling may not be felt by U.S. citizens since they are not directly involved in the problem; they did not suffer through 30 years of fighting, they were not wounded, their brothers and sons were not killed, and they were not dispersed from their land.

The president said that As-Sadat is proceeding on the road of capitulation and not peace. He might be able to conclude a separate agreement with Israel. However, he cannot achieve an agreement for a comprehensive peace because the conflict in the area is not an Egyptian-Israeli one but an Arab-Israeli one. The Egyptian side's ending the conflict does not end the entire Arab-Israeli conflict.

The head and members of the delegation expressed their thanks to President al-Asad and appreciation for the clarity of his viewpoints.

The U.S. congressional delegation left Damascus this afternoon following a 3-day visit to Syria.

TEXT OF AL-ASAD INTERVIEW WITH NEWSWEEK'S DE BORCHGRAVE

JN090806Y Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0415 GMT 9 Jan 78 JN

[Text of Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad's interview with NEWSWEEK senior editor Arnaud de Borchgrave--read by announcer; date and place not specified]

[Text] Question: President as-Sadat has been accused of treason by the Palestinians, Iraqis, Libyans, Algerians, South Yemenis and the Syrian authorities. What constitutes treason in his policies so far? Wasn't his speech at the Knesset similar to the statement you would have made at the Geneva conference if it had convened?

Answer: As-Sadat went to the occupied land, to Israel, and this means recognition of Israel. He went to Jerusalem, which means recognition of Jesusalem as the unified capital of Israel at a time when we are against foreigners going to Jerusalem. He deviated from Arab unanimity and dealt separately in matters where it was not his right. He destroyed the peace efforts which were about to ripen. He left the road of peace and adopted capitualtion. He weakened the Arab stand, and he acted against the desires and aspirations of the Arab masses. These are some of the significant things characterizing As-Sadat's visit to Israel.

Question: As-Sadat reiterated for the second time this week that he will not give up on the issue of full Israeli withdrawal from the Arab territories occupied in 1967. Isn't this stand commensurate with yours?

Answer: This is not true. As-Sadat is heading toward a separate deal. [safqah munfaridah], and the road As-Sadat is following can only lead to such a deal. He realizes this well. At any rate, this separate deal is one thing and peace another. When he went to Jerusalem, he had such a result in mind. This is what prompted me to tell him during our meeting in Damascus that his visit to Israel would destroy the peace efforts.

Question: As-Sadat's stand concerning a Palestinian state on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip is certainly in harmony with what you have said in past years regarding your stand. What do you say about this?

Answer: Words are one thing and action is something else. We support the establishment of a Palestinian state. We also support pursuing the road that would lead to the establishment of that state. Is President as-Sadat following the road leading to the establishment of that state?

Question: Mr President, would I be correct in assuming that you share As-Sadat's general concept for peace, namely, a return to the 1967 borders with the appropriate guarantees, including the establishment of demilitarized zones on both sides of the border, the establishment of early warning stations and so forth, and the establishment of a Palestinian state in return for real peace on at least in return for a kind of a state of no war which we now have between East and West Europe?

Answer: The question should read like this? Does President as-Sadat share with us the opinion that peace should be based on the full withdrawal from territories occupied in 1967, the guaranteed rights of the Palestinian people, and the establishment of the Palestinian state, and does he believe that this can be achieved only through unanimous Arab moves? Does he believe that this cannot be achieved except through the formula of not bowing to the enemy and of preserving the possibility of using all available and legitimate means to regain our full rights and to achieve peace? The objective and the means are an integral whole, and peace cannot be viewed in isolation from the road to peace. Peace is an honorable objective and the road toward it is a noble means. As-Sadat's conduct is not commensurate with these facts.

Question: After the second Sinai agreement in September 1975, you had fears about signing a third Sinai agreement and about a separate peace [sulh munfarid] between Egypt and Israel being concluded. Since As-Sadat has turned down an Israeli proposal regarding full withdrawal from the Sinai within 5 years, since he continues to support the establishment of a real Palestinian state, thus opposing the self-rule as proposed by Israel, and since he demands complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from the West Bank, why don't you unify ranks with Egypt, especially since As-Sadat has categorically rejected an Egyptian-Israeli agreement as a substitute for an overall settlement?

Answer: Everything floating to the surface now is theatrical action aimed at concealing facts and misleading the Arab masses. What is now taking place is leading toward a certain agreement about the Sinai and a certain formula on the West Bank with the aim of liquidating the Palestinian cause.

Question: What is it that As-Sadat has given up and cannot regain? Is it the war option, for instance?

Answer: He has given up both the war and the peace options.

Question: Does this mean, therefore, a state of no war, no peace in the Middle East?

Answer: The situation in the Middle East does not depend on what As-Sadat says or does. You are very much influenced by what President as-Sadat has said more than once and by his repeated statements that Egypt is the key to peace or war.

Of course, we are proud of Egypt and its role. However, what As-Sadat says about the key to peace and war being in the hand of the ruler of Egypt lacks proof. The ancient and modern history of our region does not at all substantiate what As-Sadat is saying; otherwise, we would not have to dispute As-Sadat's behavior and would have no choice but to simply approve what he does. Syria has always been the cradle of Arab nationalism. It has never surrendered to any foreign invasion. Whenever certain quarters in the Arab homeland surrendered, Syria would say "no" and launch counterattacks politically and militarily to restore the situation to what it should have been. This happened in the case of the crusader invasion and in the case of the present Zionist invasion.

Question: As-Sadat says the Arabs must abandon the policy of obtaining all or nothing and that there must be give and take in negotiations. Is this not the substance of a rational policy in an age when small disputes quickly mushroom into major confrontations and wars?

Answer: I ask: Is he addressing this to the Arabs or to Israel?

Question: He is addressing both sides.

Answer: I feel that when he addresses such talk to the Arabs he is being unjust to them and is condemning their entire struggle over the past 30 years at least. The situation now is: rights or no rights. We cannot abandon or concede our rights. We cannot accept or surrender to what is not just.

Question: As-Sadat admits, for instance, that, like its Arab neighbors, Israel has legitimate security interests. Do you agree to this?

Answer: In light of what is evident, Israel has expansionist, rather than security, interests. Proof of this is the fact that what Israel is proposing and demanding under the lable of "security interests" has not been demanded by any other country, big or small.

Question: Mr President, if you fear that Egypt will proceed alone and thus create a final split in the ranks of the frontline states, why don't you and Jordan join Egypt in the current negotiations instead of staying away as now is the case?

Answer: Because we have chosen the path of peace.

Question: Then As-Sadat's path leads to war?

Answer: It does not lead to peace.

Question: Two negotiating committees have been formed at the ministerial level. These committees will meet in Cairo and Jerusalem. These committees are a new fact whether we like it or not. Where will this lead in your opinion? Why has your foreign minister rejected in advance anything that might result from these negotiations?

Answer: We cannot erect a sound building on an unsound foundation. Wrong beginnings inevitably lead to wrong results. Therefore, we cannot expect anything useful for a just peace to result from these committees or any other activities arranged in this way.

Question: As-Sadat says that he hopes to complete the paperwork which will enable the Geneva conference to immediately deal with the crux of the problem, that is, the application of Resolutions 242 and 338 and the establishment of a Palestinian state. Why don't you give him the opportunity to do this?

Answer: I believe he realizes that he worked and is working to block the road to Geneva, because the Geneva conference cannot be a cover for separate deals concluded in the dark.

Question: What role do you believe Jordan should play along the road toward a comprehensive settlement?

Answer: Jordan is a frontline state. It has a role within the framework of an overall settlement of the cause. When circumstances are realized which would be conducive to achieving a just peace, Jordan, as a frontline nation, will then have a role to play in achieving a just peace, because this kind of peace cannot be achieved unless there is unanimous Arab agreement on it. In other words, I cannot see a role to be played by Jordan within the context of separate deals.

Question: Since it has hardened its attitude and started to adopt the attitude of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the PLO does not seem close to bringing about the possibility of setting up a Palestinian state. If the PLO wants to participate in the negotiating process, should it not reconsider its attitude?

Answer: It seems to me that regarding current developments the PLO has only one choice: to beef up Palestinian national unity and to strengthen its struggle practices.

Question: Do you mean its armed struggle?

Answer: I do not mean that the struggle denotes armed struggle alone. The struggle for the sake of national issues throughout history has not been solely this kind of struggle practice, but has been the employment of different military, political and other forms. At any rate, I am not now defining what the Palestinian organizations should practice, because the definition of such practices is the PLO's responsibility.

Question: Begin said Israel will negotiate anything except its destruction. And since Israel sees the PLO calling for its annihilation, it will not deal with the organization. Do you really believe the PLO is calling for the destruction of Israel?

Answer: Let this question be directed to the PLO; let it be directed to the PLO Executive Committee members and let him address this question to them: "I want to negotiate with you, but not over the destruction of Israel," and let him hear the answer.

Question: If he does so, will the answer leave a good impression on them?

Answer: This is their business, not mine.

Question: Years ago you and As-Sadat advocated a solution to the Palestinian cause within the framework of a Palestinian state on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip closely linked with Jordan. Is that still your attitude?

Answer: I said in the past and I still say now that we will approve anything to be agreed upon between the Palestinians and Jordanians.

Question: How many Palestinians do you feel could be absorbed in a state on the West Bank and Gaza in addition to the 1.1 million already there?

Answer: It might not be a large number. It is necessary that a large number of refugees return to the West Bank and Gaza, because the refugees in accordance with UN resolutions, should return to their homes from which they were evicted.

Question: If you were in Israel's place, would you withdraw prior to whatever the future harbors for the West Bank?

Answer: It would be an impossible assumption to be in Israel's place. I will never be in Israel's place because I cannot be aggressive, looking to occupying the lands of others, evicting people from their homes and then refusing to withdraw from the occupied territories despite UN resolutions which demand me to withdraw. In what way does Israel have the right to determine the future of the West Bank? Is there any country in the world that has the right to determine the future of the territories of a neighboring country?

Question: What I have been talking about is the principle, not the occupation or aggression. I believe you will certainly not withdraw from Lebanon until you are sure that the civil war will not recur. I would do exactly the same if I were in your place. I would not withdraw from Lebanon before knowing what lies ahead.

Answer: If the Lebanese had asked us to withdraw, we would have withdrawn immediately. But the Lebanese need us and therefore did not make this request. On the other hand, the Palestinians are demanding the withdrawal of Israel. At any rate, there is no comparison between the two. We and our Lebanese brothers are one people with a common history, while the situation on the West Bank is different. We went to Lebanon to save it from the fighting following an appeal from children, women and men. Of course, Israel has not occupied the West Bank to save the Palestinians.

Question: How can you guarantee the peaceful coexistence of a small Palestinian state with all its neighbors? Will this be through a confederation with Jordan, Syria and Lebanon?

Answer: Any formula or relationship between the Palestinian state and the rest of the Arab states will have to be decided by the leadership of that state and the Arab leaderships concerned. At any rate, I do not think that this will be a difficult problem.

Question: There is no firm and agreed Arab negotiating stand concerning the West Bank and Gaza except that Israel must completely withdraw in return for the recognition of the pre-5 June 1967 boundaries and security guarantees. Then the Palestinians would have the right to determine their future after being liberated from Israeli occupation. All this seems vague. In light of your experience in Lebanon, you surely cannot blame anyone if he refuses to leave the future of the West Bank to chance?

Answer: Where is the ambiguity in the formula? What are the justifications for the comparison cited? If the intention is not to determine the quarter which will be negotiating the Palestine question, then there is no ambiguity, because we have agreed that the PLO is the party which will negotiate on Palestinian rights. This was the unanimous decision adopted by the Arabs at the Rabat summit.

Question: If the Arab confrontation states do not approve Begin's 26-point plan, don't you think Israel's neighbors must propose their own peace plan?

Answer: We proposed our plan in 1973. We said that peace means withdrawal from the territories occupied by Israel in 1967, guaranteeing the rights of the Palestinian Arab people under the UN resolutions and ending the state of belligerency.

Question: Israel has not rejected the West Bank's right to self-determination. It has not rejected in principle military withdrawal after a specific period of time. Is this position not worth considering?

Answer: This is something new. What is known and definite is that Israel is determined not to withdraw from all the territories occupied in 1967. It is also determined to remain in the West Bank and Gaza and to consider all these territories as part of Israel. This has always been stressed by Israeli officials, even in the course of the recent developments. What is known of the Begin plan also confirms this.

Question: Opponents, rivals and even enemies throughout the world talk to one another. Why don't the Arabs and Israel do the same? Take Japan and the Soviet Union, for example. Japan says the Soviet Union has annexed part of its territory. Yet there are diplomatic relations between the two countries.

Answer: The Arabs agreed to negotiate after 1973 in accordance with the UN resolutions and under the aegis of the United Nations. Accordingly, the peace conference in Geneva should take place under the supervision of the United Nations and under the chairmanship of the two superpowers. However, what is now taking place is far removed from the significance and substance of the peace conference in Geneva and consequently from international legitimacy and the UN resolutions.

Question: What exactly are the Arabs in general and Syria in particular prepared to do at present for the sake of peace?

Answer: There is nothing for us to do now other than what we have done in the past. I see various interactions now taking place in the area, and in time these interactions will assume a final form. The peace process in Geneva now [fragment as heard] This deadlock could last for an indefinite time. It is also difficult to define how the move toward peace will progress in the future. What I want to stress is that peace remains our objective and we will continue to devote all our efforts to it. We want a just peace in the whole sense of the word "justice." What is important is to keep this fact--the fact of a just peace--clear for everybody.

Question: Then why did you join the rejectionist front at the recent Tripoli conference?

Answer: What took place in Tripoli was not a rejectionist front. It was an Arab front of steadfastness. We had decided not to retreat from the Zionist aggression and to stand fast in the face of this onslaught. This is because the moves taking place in the area are part of a plot against the Arab nation aimed at imposing capitulation. We will not allow this plot to succeed. We decided to stand fast and to resist and defeat this plot. Accordingly, the front of steadfastness was set up in Tripoli. In the first clause of the declaration issued in Tripoli, we said that these moves and President as-Sadat's visit had destroyed the peace efforts. We decided to stand fast against the plot and resist it and to bring back the normal healthy status to the area so as to enable it to move toward a just and honorable peace.

Question: Your information minister told me yesterday that it is now clear that the United States is advocating a state of no war, no peace because otherwise it would not have supported As-Sadat's initiative and its consequences in this area. My question is: Do you feel that the previous U.S. role as a mediator has been overtaken by events?

Answer: The U.S. support for As-Sadat's initiative does not serve peace. It seems that the United States has confined its role within the framework of the current moves. This is what is obvious to us.

Question: What is real attitude of the Saudi Kingdom? I have heard that Saudi Arabia was somewhat disturbed when you rushed to unify ranks between yourselves and the rest of the Arab radicals. What is the Saudi attitude?

Answer: Our relations with Saudi Arabia are good. Their attitude toward the visit was expressed in a statement by the Royal Court. The statement points out that they had no prior knowledge of the visit and that they did not support it. I believe that all of us in the Arab countries want to always provide the requisites and formulas necessary to confront all challenges which are being concocted by Zionism and which it is trying to impose on the Arab homeland. As you know, I met with my brothers in the Saudi Kingdom a few days ago. A fraternal and amicable atmosphere prevailed during our meeting. There is nothing disturbing our relations and cooperation.

Question: Saudi officials told me that Libya has approved the financing of your new purchases of Soviet equipment and that, during his talks with 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, Soviet leader Brezhnev agreed to meet your defensive needs. Can I understand from this that your differences with Moscow have been reduced or would I be correct in assuming that Moscow is obstructing the achievement of any overall settlement which it considers favorable to the West?

Answer: The best I can say is that we have resisted the current moves aimed at imposing capitulation on the Arabs, liquidating the Palestinian cause and obstructing the establishment of a just peace. The Soviet Union holds the same views and concepts regarding these moves. Accordingly, the Soviet Union supports us. However, the Soviet Union did not tell us whether it supports or rejects a solution favorable to the West. It has always said that it supports a just solution that would achieve a just peace, and this is what we are striving for.

Question: Iraq suggested a confrontation pact against Israel with Iraq, Syria and the PLO at a time when two of three sides are against UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, while you support the two resolutions. How would such a pact be established?

Answer: This should not prevent these sides from forming a single front. In 1973 we and Egypt fought together under a single command at a time when Egypt had accepted Resolution 242 while Syria had not. After 1967 we formed the eastern front made up of Syria, Iraq and Jordan at a time when Syria and Iraq had rejected Resolution 242 while Jordan had accepted it. The eastern and western fronts were under a single command.

Question: What is the purpose behind the new anti-As-Sadat summit which Algeria is proposing?

Answer: We are in the process of strengthening the pan-Arab front, that is, the front of steadfastness which we formed. As to what we will discuss exactly, the details, this is a matter we are considering now.

Question: Western critics say the PLO is backed by radical states such as Syria, Iraq, Libya and the PDRY and that these states are backed by the USSR. This is the (?defense) line which Moscow hopes to establish near the oil artery which feeds Western Europe, the United States and Japan. Are you satisfied with being in such an alliance?

Answer: The USSR helps our just cause and supports us in liberating our occupied territories and guaranteeing the rights of the Palestinian Arab people, and consequently in achieving a just peace. Such a stand must be viewed positively by all those concerned about peace in the Arab region, Europe and the United States.

Question: As-Sadat said a week ago that Syria is doing what Russia wants and that the PLO, which greatly depends on Syria and Russia, is doing what Syria wants. This makes it very difficult for Egypt to obtain support for its initiative, especially the support of the Palestinians themselves. Yet, As-Sadat says he is determined to obtain their legitimate rights and that this is the crux of the peace settlement.

Answer: As-Sadat knows better than anyone else that, unlike others, we in Syria have the absolute right to make our own decisions. There are many examples to prove what I have said. I will not mention any of them now, because they are known to the Arabs and the world. President as-Sadat is not being objective when he confuses the friendships which can exist between nations and the subservience under which certain states exist. It is our right to ask whether by this continuous campaign, which complements his visit to occupied Jerusalem, As-Sadat wants to further weaken the Arabs by driving away everyone who assists and supports us. The Soviet Union gives us assistance in our just struggle to liberate our territories. Our Arab nation cannot disavow this good deed.

Question: Henry Kissinger says the day will come when the Arab leaders who are now condemning As-Sadat's initiative will be grateful that the biggest Arab state has taken upon itself the burden of the first and most difficult step toward peace. What do you say?

Answer: Naturally, I do not think he was right in saying that. If we viewed things as he does, we would not have adopted our present stand.

Question: Your friend Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu may not agree with you on that.

Answer: I think the name of President Ceausescu was involved in the subject contrary to his real role and opinion on the recent moves. President Ceausescu had no prior knowledge of the Jerusalem visit. He was involved in this to conceal the real quarters which played the basic roles.

ATH-THAWRAH: AS-SADAT'S MOVES DRIVE PEACE AWAY

JN091217Y Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0415 GMT 9 Jan 78 JN

[From the press review]

[Text] Under the headline "As-Sadat's Treason Has Blown Up the Basis for Peace," the newspaper ATH-THAWRAH says: Despite what is being said in Cairo, occupied Palestine or Washington, peace is moving away instead of coming closer. It has reached the point where one is convinced that no peace will prevail in this region so long as the parties who are trying to delude the world that they are working for that peace continue to be present. We specifically mention here the Egyptian regime, led by Anwar as-Sadat. Before As-Sadat's visit, possibilities existed to establish peace, but now after what has happened, even speaking of peace is pure imagination.

The basis for peace the whole world was talking about has been blasted at the roots. The United States, particularly the Carter administration, through its numerous official statements and declarations, has talked a lot about the Palestinian people and their right to a national homeland and to self-determination. But now, after As-Sadat's deviation and visit to occupied Jerusalem, everything has changed. Carter himself strongly opposes the establishment of a Palestinian state, thus adopting the Israeli theory that the existence of an independent Palestinian state means the destruction of Israel, despite the fact that many reports by the U.S. intelligence services state that Israel's military strength equals that of all the Arab states combined. This means that the U.S.-Zionist theory they are using as an excuse has really collapsed.

ATH-THAWRAH ends its commentary by saying: Al-Asad's Syria has stressed that it will accept nothing less than what has been approved by the international community, namely, no solution and no peace without the unconditional and complete withdrawal from the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, Jerusalem, the Sinai and the Golan. After that, the whole world will have the right to ask the Arabs to offer acceptable guarantees to establish peace. Only then would it be possible for Israel and the United States to talk about peace conditions. However, now while Israel is still occupying all of the Palestinian territory and large segments of Egyptian and Syrian territory, it would be very wrong to pay attention to what Israel and the United States are proposing regarding peace. The Arabs, particularly under these circumstances, should work together seriously and quickly to overthrow the treacherous and shameful regime and form an Arab national fighting front to achieve a just and lasting peace and not the capitulation they are trying to impose on our nation through the treacherous and shameful rule in Al-Qubbah Palace.

SUDAN

MATERIALS ON AS-SADAT'S VISIT TO SUDAN 7-8 JAN

Cairo Relay of Arrival

NC071500 [Editorial Report NC] Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic at 1203 GMT on 7 January began a live relay of Egyptian President Anwar as-Sadat's arrival at Khartoum airport. According to the announcer, As-Sadat was welcomed by Sudanese President Ja'far Numayri and Sudanese ministers and senior officials. Following the reception ceremonies As-Sadat made a brief statement and held a brief press conference at the airport, but reception was too poor to text from this relay. According to the announcer, the two presidents left for the guest palace. Different announcers along the route to the palace described the motorcade and the popular welcome accorded As-Sadat. The relay ended at 1300 GMT.

Omdurman Report on Arrival

LD071626Y Omdurman Domestic Service in Arabic 1300 GMT 7 Jan 78 LD/EA

[Excerpt] President as-Sadat arrived at Khartoum airport at 1400 this afternoon on a visit to the country during which he will hold talks with Leader-President Ja'far Muhammad Numayri on the current situation in the Arab region, issues of common interest to the two fraternal countries and international issues of the hour. His excellency was accorded an official and popular reception. Leading those welcoming President as-Sadat were the leader-president, Ja'far Muhammad Numayri; Abu al-Qasim Muhammad Ibrahim, first vice president of the republic and secretary general of the Sudanese Socialist Union [SSU]; Ar-Rashid at-Tahir Bakr, vice president of the republic and foreign minister; members of the Executive Bureau of the SSU Central Committee; ministers and senior officials; and members of the diplomatic corps.

As-Sadat Airport Press Conference

LD071851Y Omdurman Domestic Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 7 Jan 78 LD/EA

[Press conference held by Egyptian President Anwar as-Sadat at Khartoum airport on 7 January--recorded]

[Text] [As-Sadat] First of all, I am pleased to be able to address to my people--President Numayri and our people in Sudan--greetings and to express appreciation for the firm, fraternal and affectionate support they have been giving their people in Egypt. I have come today to express this to my brother President Ja'far Numayri and the people in fraternal Sudan. Since we met the last time, the day when brother President Ja'far was visiting Cairo after my return from the Jerusalem initiative, many developments have taken place.

As we are partners in history, in destiny, in kinship and in everything, we must evaluate all that has taken place. And as I spoke to you before [as heard], the last evaluation we made, namely, after the visit to Jerusalem--since then many developments have taken place. Very many, and many meetings, including the Ismailia meeting, the visit of Carter and the point at which this issue has arrived [as heard]. I have now come to put this before my brother President Ja'far because, as I said, we are partners. We must meet and make an assessment of the latest stage and then the next stage.

The rest of the deatils about the work of the committee and such matters, as you have asked about [passage indistinct]. This is a matter that is proceeding perfectly along course, but what I am interested in today is to evaluate not just the questions I have put forth since President Ja'far's visit to us, with regard to which very many developments have taken place, but there are also questions that are of concern to us in our region, in the Red Sea, in Africa, in the Horn of Africa. All this will be discussed with my brother President Ja'far, so that we reach an evaluation and then make preparations for the next steps, God willing.

It will be an evaluation about which every Arab--who understands and appreciates that since the October war we have moved from the age of slogans and emotionalism to the age of reason and logic, to sound construction, to free construction, to free decision and to free will--will be proud. All of us in Egypt are proud of our brothers and people in Sudan under the leadership of brother President Ja'far.

[Unidentified reporter] What are the next steps as part of the bold efforts Your Excellency has been making for finding a just and permanent solution?

[As-Sadat] This is an area I shall touch on after my talks with brother President Ja'far, God willing. We shall tell you then.

[Question indistinct]

[As-Sadat] It might take 2 months, this is because the meetings of the two committees, one political and the other military, will make this clear, but I am optimistic.

[Unidentified reporter] Your Excellency, what is your evaluation of the results of your initiative up to this moment?

[As-Sadat] Excellent. I shall tell my brother Ja'far about them and then, God willing, we shall let you know after our meeting.

As-Sadat, Numayri Talks

NC071916Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1830 GMT 7 Jan 78 NC

[Text] The official talks between Presidents Anwar as-Sadat and Ja'far Numayri began at the Hall of Friendship in Khartoum at 1800 tonight. The talks were attended on the Egyptian side by Deputy Prime Minister and Sudan Affairs Minister Dr Hafiz Ghanim, Deputy Prime Minister and War and War Production Minister Gen 'Abd al-Ghani al-Jamasi, Foreign Minister Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil, head of the president's office Hasan Kamil and Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Dr Butrus Ghali.

The talks were attended on the Sudanese side by the First Vice President Abu al-Qasim Muhammad Ibrahim, Vice President and Foreign Minister ar-Rashid at-Tahir, Executive Council member Mahdi Mustafa al-Hadi and Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Dr Francis Deng.

The talks lasted about 2 hours. The radio team has learned that the discussion dealt with the latest developments in the area and with relations between the two countries.

President Muhammad Anwar as-Sadat briefed President Ja'far Numayri on the developments after his trip to Jerusalem, the outcome of his latest meeting with President Jimmy Carter in Aswan and the results of the meeting held in Ismailia with Israeli Prime Minister Menahem Begin.

During the meeting a review was made of the situation in Africa and especially in the Horn of Africa. When the talks ended President as-Sadat attended the dinner President Ja'far Numayri gave in the Hall of Friendship.

Sudanese Officials' Statements

JN072020Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1920 GMT 7 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Khartoum, 7 January--Sudanese Vice President and Foreign Minister ar-Rashid at-Tahir has asserted that the meeting between Presidents Anwar as-Sadat and Ja'far Numayri will result in several resolutions that would give the peace initiative a strong push forward. In a statement broadcast over the Omdurman radio this evening, Ar-Rashid at-Tahir said that the whole world is waiting for the outcome of this meeting owing to the serious time at which this meeting is taking place and, also, owing to the significant topics Presidents as-Sadat and Numayri will discuss.

The Sudanese vice president referred to the support expressed by President Numayri and the Sudanese people for President as-Sadat's initiative along the road of peace and expressed the hope that the two presidents will adopt decisions at their meeting that would push forward the steps that are being taken along the road of peace. He also expressed the hope that the meeting will adopt decisions that will push forward the issue of integration between Egypt and Sudan.

Omdurman Radio also broadcasts a statement by Sudanese First Vice President Abu al-Qasim Muhammad Ibrahim in which he described President as-Sadat's visit to Sudan as a fraternal and meaningful expression confirming the extent of cohesion between the two peoples. Abu al-Qasim said that the Sudanese masses who received President as-Sadat today expressed their full satisfaction and positive support for the peace initiative, as well as their strong support for President Numayri in his strong support for this initiative.

The first vice president described President as-Sadat's initiative as being a serious and right step toward achieving peace. He also described the battle for peace waged by President as-Sadat as decisive, just like the decisive battle during the glorious October when As-Sadat transported the Arab nation from weakness to dignity and strength. Abu al-Qasim called on all the Arab brothers to unify efforts and to adopt a positive stand toward the initiative, confirming that he who carried out this daring initiative is capable of achieving peace, while others want the peace process to stop.

Numayri Statement to MENA

JN072058Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 2035 GMT 7 Jan 78 JN

[Text] Khartoum, 7 January--Sudanese President Ja'far Numayri has stated that the warm welcome accorded President as-Sadat today by the Sudanese people reflects the eternal ties between the two peoples and expresses the Sudanese people's support for President as-Sadat's initiative for a just and durable peace in the Middle East area.

In an exclusive statement to the MENA Khartoum correspondent, President Numayri said that this welcome by the Sudanese people affirms their integration with the Egytpian people, who support President as-Sadat's initiative, which has been carried out within the framework of Arab strategy and which is based on liberating the occupied land and regaining the rights of the Palestinian people. In his statement President Numayri said: President as-Sadat's visit to Khartoum comes as part of the continued consultation and coordination between my brother President as-Sadat and me about the developments in the Arab situation and the issues that are of mutual interest to the two countries.

As-Sadat, Numayri Press Conference

NC082100Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1853 GMT 8 Jan 78 NC

[Press conference held jointly by Presidents Anwar as-Sadat and Ja'far Numayri at the People's Palace in Khartoum on 8 January--recorded]

[Text] [Question] I am 'Adil Rida of AL-AKHBAR newspaper. Your Excellency President Anwar as-Sadat, are there special meanings and indications Your Excellency wanted to express by choosing Sudan--to meet with its leader president, Ja'far Numayri--as the first Arab country you have visited after your trip to Jerusalem? Could Your Excellency explain the most significant features of the assessment of the situation in light of your discussions with President Ja'far Numayri?

[As-Sadat] This visit is actually significant in more than one way. First, I wanted to come personally to meet with my brother Ja'far and the fraternal Sudanese people to express the gratitude of the entire Egyptian people--government, people and leadership--for the support the Egyptian initiative has received from our brothers in Sudan, headed by brother President Ja'far. The second significant thing is that since we established the Unified Political Command, we--President Ja'far and I--have always coordinated our actions by agreeing on each move.

Brother President Ja'far has been generous, and as usual he expressed the feelings of our entire Arab nation when he kindly visited us after my return from Jerusalem. We availed ourselves of this meeting and assessed all aspects of the situation. After this visit I wanted, as I have previously said, to acquaint my brother Ja'far and the fraternal people in Sudan with the latest developments of the situation, especially because many events have rapidly taken place since our last meeting. These events included, for example, the call to hold the Cairo conference, various contacts with the world leaders and the visit of Carter. I also wanted to facilitate an agreement on future moves on the basis of evaluating the situation at the present stage. These are the significant aspects. I wish to say--and I want all the world to hear me--that in all my moves I actually depend on the solid support of brother President Ja'far and the Sudanese people as well as on the support of their brothers, the Egyptian people.

At my meetings in Jerusalem and afterward, I explained that there is full coordination between President Ja'far and me regarding the policy of Egypt and Sudan and that I always reach agreement with President Ja'far before I make any move. What is important in all this is that Egypt and Sudan constitute two-thirds of the Arab nation.

Therefore, when Sudan speaks, it does not speak for itself alone but it speaks for Egypt and Sudan. When Egypt speaks, it also speaks for Egypt and Sudan. Praise be to God that throughout history, the Sudanese and Egyptian people have been a support for each other. I thank God that my relations with President Ja'far have been fraternal relations on both the personal and official levels. They have been relations characterized by full support and understanding as a result of our continuing assessment of the situations and moves.

[Question] A question for President Numayri. Your splendid support of the peace initiative was a courageous stand in support of President as-Sadat and a big blow to the attempts at outbidding and the attempts to abuse the initiatives. You also said to President as-Sadat that Egypt, which has offered sacrifices, blood and martyrs--the sons of peasants and workers and the brother of President as-Sadat--is above and stronger than the attempts of little people, even if such attempts resound like drums. Would you, Mr President, throw further light on the real aims of the rejectionist states and the extent of their links with the Soviet conspiratorial plans in the area?

[Numayri] In the name of God, Most Gracious, Most Merciful. First, I would like to express my happiness and pride at the visit of my brother Anwar as-Sadat to Sudan to convey thanks, on behalf of the Egyptian people, to the Sudanese people, who have, on my behalf, expressed their feelings toward their brother and the fraternal people of Egypt. The visit occupies a special place in our hearts. It clearly denotes the ties and fraternity between the Sudanese and Egyptian people and the fraternity between the Sudanese and Egyptian people and the sound coordination and action on all problems facing the two peoples.

What we hear from the so-called rejection states means nothing to us here in Sudan, because they do not seriously and objectively look at the Arab problems and the problems of our nation and do not try to reach a sound solution to benefit our peoples. The word rejection sounds unpleasant. You have all heard that the first resolution adopted by the Tripoli conference in Libya was to reject any result produced by the As-Sadat initiative, by fraternal Egypt and the people of Egypt. Because of such a resolution you can put these states in their proper place. The resolution was ridiculous and cannot come from states that are trying to solve their problems with the necessary logic and objectivity. Therefore, these states have deviated a great deal from the path taken by the Arab nation in its struggle toward peace.

[Question] Efforts are being exerted to reunite Arab ranks. Are you optimistic about these efforts and are there any specific steps [words indistinct] these efforts?

[As-Sadat] I want to explain something important. All our Arab people probably realize that Arab solidarity has been and still is the main target of Egypt and Sudan. What happened in the October war and the roles the Arab brothers played everywhere are perhaps the best proof of this. Nobody can say that Egypt or Sudan had a secondary role in this. On the contrary, Arab solidarity has rested on the efforts of Egypt and Sudan everywhere in the Arab homeland ever since Egypt and Sudan decided to abandon the classification of the Arab nation into monarchies, republics and progressive and reactionary regimes. It was this state of affairs which tore the Arab nation apart. We in Egypt and Sudan can say that we have discarded all this. Arab solidarity was manifested in the October war.

There are some now who lament the fate of Arab solidarity. What has happened? All of us admit that there was Arab solidarity during the October war. But also during the October war the foolish child in Libya opposed this solidarity. Iraq adopted the same line. In Algeria President Boumediene carried out a role which we must actually point out to him. Soon afterward he revealed his true nature in the Tripoli conference. We never believed that he would adopt such a stand. It is sufficient, as I said before, that we now classify him as another Al-Qadhdhafi of the Arab nation. Arab solidarity is in good shape because the present picture existed before, during and after the October war because of these people's stands. These people spoke the same words and adopted the same stands during the first and second disengagement but despite this, Arab solidarity survived. This is why I say that Arab solidarity is in good shape and we must not deal this card, as I said before, to some people to play with and try to impose their views or to resort to blackmail, using the word Arab solidarity.

At our discussions yesterday, President Ja'far and I agreed on specific steps regarding the future despite our knowledge that they cannot change the course of the Arab nation or stop the march of the caravan to the end of the road.

[Indistinct question in English with Arabic translation superimposed] To a question posed to President Anwar as-Sadat whether the Palestinians will catch up with the train of peace, the president said:

[As-Sadat in English] There has been much more than this between 'Arafat and me, but we all know that 'Arafat cannot exercise his will because of the pressure from the Soviet Union and Syria. If I disclose what we have agreed upon between Yasir 'Arafat and me, everyone will be astonished. But as I stated, he cannot exercise his free will, and it was really astonishing to me when he refused to convene in Cairo. [as heard] By this they really have lost the great move that would have proved his [word indistinct] and in recognition of this. When I made the decision for the Cairo preparatory conference, I sent the invitation of the Palestinians to the PLO and they refused. Let us hope that in the future, as I have already discussed the whole case with President Numayri, let us hope that out of the declaration of principles that we are after in future steps of convening the committees in Jerusalem and Cairo--let us hope that they can join with us in Cairo for the establishment of peace and fulfilling a comprehensive settlement.

[Question in English] Mr President, there are reports of [words indistinct] more settlements to be built in the occupied Arab territory, yesterday, Cairo press [words indistinct].

[As-Sadat in English] As I have already said before, it appears that I have taken not only the whole world but I have taken also the Israelis by surprise. And it appears also that until this moment, old conceptions prevail there but as I have already said [sentence left incomplete].

[Question in English] You said it before?

[As-Sadat in English] We shall not agree at all upon a soldier or civilian under a comprehensive settlement to remain on our soil. We shall not agree upon any Israeli soldier to stay on our territory under and pretense. Let us hope that they may reconsider their position and try to get the new conception of the Jerusalem initiative. [as heard]

[Question] President as-Sadat, it was reported in Cairo that an agreement was reached between you and President Carter on the right of self-determination for the Palestinians according to specific steps in order to move the peace process forward. What are these steps?

[As-Sadat] As you recall, during his visit to Poland President Carter made a statement approving a Palestinian entity and disapproving the establishment of a state. At the time, I expressed my opinion in a statement rejecting this and not agreeing to it. The Palestinians must have the right of self-determination. When President Carter visited us in Aswan in the last few days, we reassessed the situation. In the statement he made then, President Carter mentioned the need for the participation of Palestinians in determining their future. He used the word "determining." Therefore, I considered the disagreement which took place between us as being over because the goal is for the Palestinians to enjoy the right of self-determination and not autonomy.

The Palestinians must have the right to establish their state and not just the establishment of a Palestinian entity. Regarding the link of the state with Jordan, as you all know, I have been calling for this for more than 2 years. It is not a new stand. A link must exist between the new state and Jordan to be agreed upon between the two sides according to their own free will. This is the position. As for the future steps, these will include the participation of the U.S. secretary of state with the foreign ministers who will meet in Jerusalem on 16 January, God willing, to work toward reaching what is called the statement of principles. Until they meet, I see no reason for us to discuss any further details.

[Question] President Numayri, what measures have been taken to prevent foreign intervention into African states and to preserve their independence?

[Numayri] I have several times talked about the presence of foreign interference in Africa, in the Horn of Africa, in northwest and in southwest Africa and in other areas. I want to explain that this interference is carried out by the Soviet Union, which has introduced a new method to our countries and continent--the method of division and interference by neighboring states by supporting them with arms and ammunition.

Concerning such inteference, we have adopted several steps, including an explanation of this interference to all our African brothers. This was done through direct and indirect contacts. Second, we have also held direct contacts with the states concerned which have come under the influence of the Soviet Union and which implement its policy, warning them of such a course. Third, we have pointed out to the whole world the danger posed by Soviet interference. Fourth, we have begun to consolidate our domestic fronts because the Soviet method is aimed at weakening and dividing the domestic fronts in the country and then benefiting from such division.

In general, these are defensive measures. The Soviet Union is a great world power, but the people are always stronger and can struggle and defend their lives and interests when they realize what dangers are threatening them. At present, we should clarify such dangers using all methods.

[Indistinct question in English with Arabic traslation superimposed] Answering a question about his opinion on the results achieved after the summit meeting between President as-Sadat and President Numayri, President Numayri said:

[Indistinct answer by Numayri with Arabic translation superimposed] The relations between the two countries and their geographical position (?unites us). We live in the same area as one family. We are convinced that President as-Sadat has been moving in the right direction since his visit to Jerusalem. He is now trying to [words indistinct] the Israelis must leave the territories they occupied to allow the Palestinians to live on their lands.

If we listen to President as-Sadat's statements, we will find out that he demanded more than the Rabat strategy called for. At our meeting with him yesterday, we were convinced that he still adheres to the Arab strategy. It is also clear that he does not seek to conclude a separate agreement with Israel but that he is working for all the Arabs. Since he went to Jerusalem, As-Sadat has been working hard to make the Arabs participate in his moves, particularly the parties concerned. He has invited the Palestinians, Syria, Jordan and Lebanon but they have refused to come. Some are waiting to see what the results of the Cairo conference will be before participating in it. This gives us hope.

[Indistinct question in English]

[As-Sadat] I quite agree with what Numayri has stated.

[Indistinct question in Arabic]

[As-Sadat] As I have said before, in our discussions with Israel, we seek, as President Ja'far put it, a comprehensive solution and not a bilateral solution between Egypt and Israel. You have perhaps heard that there is no problem regarding the Sinai issue. Indeed, the Israeli prime minister said this in the Knesset and he added that the international borders are the borders that existed between Egypt and old Palestine. There is no problem regarding Sinai. But, as I have already said, we seek a comprehensive settlement. The basis of this comprehensive settlement is the Palestinian question, from which everything stems and to which everything returns. The basis is not Sinai or the Golan Heights but the Palestinian question. If the Israelis refuse or if they adhere to the old method, then there must undoubtedly be an answer to this (?conduct).

As for the first part of the question concerning the international borders, there is no problem, as I have already said, regarding Sinai. Despite this, our aim has been and will remain a comprehensive settlement and not a bilateral agreement with Israel over Sinai.

[Question] This is another to President Numayri. In your speech to the Sudanese nation on the anniversary [words indistinct] you said that a great state is preparing [word indistinct] plan against Sudan. Is it time to disclose the name of this state and have you [words indistinct] a coordination between you and President as-Sadat to counter this state's plans against Sudan [words indistinct]?

[Numayri] I believe the state is very well known. As for coordination and action, we are, as I have already said, one family and one country. We coordinate all our actions. If we hold different views, we meet and [words indistinct] the right opinion. We do not stand from each other [words indistinct] each other without understanding another opinion. There is full coordination in all political and defensive moves.

[Conference moderator] Due to the fact that the two presidents are pressed for time, the next question will be the next to last.

[Question by Qatari radio correspondent] My question is for President Anwar as-Sadat. It consists of two parts. He has briefly answered the first part. Let me be frank, Mr President, your courageous initiative to establish peace in the Middle East has resulted in dividing the Arab world into three groups. The first group supports the initiative and is led by your brother President Numayri. I am not saying anything new when I say that he was the most courageous leader who had the best vision [words indistinct] this initiative. The second group, who do not care [words indistinct]. What is their position now? This is the first part. The second part [words indistinct] your evalutation of your initiative up to now after the developments [words indistinct].

[As-Sadat] As for the first part of the question, I fully agree that my brother Ja'far rose to the most splendid level of responsibility and courage when he expressed his opinion and that of Sudan. I take this opportunity to thank my kinsmen in Khartoum, who staged the most magnificent demonstration yesterday I have ever seen in my life. As for the persons you mentioned in the second part of this question, namely, [word indistinct] the supporters, opponents and silent people. As for the supporters, we know them and they are led by brother Ja'far. As for the opponents or the rejectionists, we know them and the extent of their hatred. This is not the first time that they have adopted such stands. They opposed the first and second disengagement and everything which could have led to a settlement merely for the sake of rejection and for reasons which are known to all of us. As for the third group, which I have described as the silent group, I wish to say that we in the Arab nation have been accustomed to be much too courteous. In other words, the courtesy is sometimes at the expense of the interests. I give as an example the Syrian Ba'th and the events which took place in Lebanon. For 2 whole years nobody spoke frankly about what was taking place in Lebanon except Egypt and Lebanon. Our other Arab brothers remained silent. The silent ones have again chosen not to comment on this initiative. Some have decided to maintain relations with the rejectionists and with us so that they may make a move at the appropriate time, for example, to reunite the ranks or restore Arab solidarity. Others might have kept silent as an Arab courtesy believing that this is the right way.

In any case, I wish to reassure you that we are with the silent ones and even with the rejectionists. When I speak, I also speak for my brother Ja'far because this question has been the subject of long discussions between us, in the past and at yesterday's meeting. We will adhere to our policy that we are prepared to forgive despite the rude method that has been used and that must end. You heard me say that I will not welcome anyone in Egypt, regardless of his position in his country, who harms Egypt and what Egypt has offered and is offering. Despite all this, we keep an open mind and we will not adopt emotional stands such as those which we hear about now.

There is one basic point I want to reassure you on. Regarding the Arab commitments, the Arab silent and not silent brothers are fulfilling their commitments. The only exception is the rejection front, naturally. The rejection front has never offered anything with the exception of Boumediene, who offered something during the battle. I am sad to say that he has finally put himself in the same ranks with the child of Libya. The other rejectionists did not offer anything before, during or after the battle. Our other silent brothers are fulfilling all their commitments.

[Indistinct question in Arabic]

[As-Sadat] The second part was the assessment of what has been accomplished and the results. Let us go back to the period before the [words indistinct]. What was the Arab situation, what was the Arab issue? I will try to sum it up in three points: 1) the Palestinian issue; 2) Geneva; and 3) the possibilities of reaching a comprehensive solution. As for the first point, the Palestinian issue, you will remember that before my visit to Jerusalem, Israel said that the West Bank and the Gaza Strip are liberated Israeli territory. The Israelis did not budge from this policy. What happened during the 40 days after my visit to Jerusalem up to the Ismailia meeting? The visit to Jerusalem lasted 30 hours. This visit took place after 30 years and four wars. What has been accomplished for the Palestinian issue? What has been accomplished is this: A change has taken place from the Israelis' claim that the West Bank and the Gaza Strip were liberated Israeli territory to the fact that the Israelis have recognized the Palestinians' right to autonomy and identity, which they previously denied completely. There was a disagreement between me and the Israelis in Ismailia because I demanded for the Palestinians the right to self-determination and to establish a state of their own. Therefore, anyone can see the difference between the state in which the Palestinian issue existed 40 days before the Ismailia talks and after my visit to Jerusalem and the Ismailia talks. I consider this a big jump that could have taken another 25 years to achieve using the old, preinitiative style. If it had not been for my initiative, the Israelis would have continued to maintain that these are liberated Israeli territories, and we would have continued to maintain that this is our territory and the Palestinians have the right to self-determination, and nothing would have happened. Another 25 years would have passed [since the 1967 war]. The situation would have remained the same to the end of this generation, and perhaps (?future generations). This is with regard to the first point, which is the Palestinian issue.

As for the second point, Geneva, I would like to tell you that before my visit to Jerusalem the following situation prevailed in the Arab nation regarding Geneva: After his meeting with the Arab and Israeli foreign ministers, Carter sent a paper on procedures. He sent it to us in October. The paper on procedures outlined points for the Geneva conference. The first point provided for a unified Arab delegation that would include Palestinians. The second point provided for geographical committees between Israel and each Arab state in order to discuss the details--for example, an Egyptian-Israeli committee, a Syrian-Israeli committee, a Lebanese-Israeli committee, and so forth. The third point in the paper Carter sent was the Palestinian issue with all its aspects. When I say with all its aspects, I mean the political aspect and the human aspect, which is [word indistinct] problem.

We received the paper. It was only a paper on procedures. I was surprised. I was surprised to know that Syria had pushed its agent--you all know him--who commands the so-called As-Sa'iqah group in the PLO to launch a [propaganda] campaign against Egypt. Over what? Over a paper on procedures, and not over the main issue. It was really ridiculous. This was followed by another paper which was called an American-Israeli paper. Syria again said: We neither agreed to this nor that. This is an imperialist-Zionist-American paper. I told them: What is this? Is this what we in the Arab nation have to quarrel about now? This was last October. The disagreement was about the paper on procedures and not about the territory occupied in 1967 or about the solution of the Palestinian problem. Israel was watching us. The campaign Syria launched was meant to keep us bogged down for another 20 years. This was before my visit to Jerusalem.

What happened after Jerusalem and the Ismailia talks? I called for the Cairo conference to prepare for Geneva. We jumped over 25 years of talk about procedures. As you have heard, in Ismailia we discussed the core of the Palestinian problem, which is autonomy, as the Israelis proposed, and self-determination, as I proposed, and withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967, including the Golan. This is a jump of 25 years. This is with regard to Geneva before and after the initiative.

As for the third point, the possibility of reaching a solution. In my estimation, before my initiative the possibility was zero. Why? Barriers of suspicion, nervousness, bitterness and hatred, accumulated over a period of 30 years and four wars, existed before my initiative. Without the removal of these barriers, it was impossible for us to reach any settlement. By God, despite everything within 30 hours of my visit to Jerusalem--after 30 years of bitterness, hatred, suspicion, and everything in the dictionary we know--it was possible to remove this barrier and to tackle our problem by ourselves instead of bringing in the Soviet Union to speak for me, as Syria is asking now, or the United States to speak for me. We have taken our issue into our hands. It would have been possible for me to talk and explain a lot on these three points, but a review of the three points shows that we have moved the issue 25 years ahead and completely ended the matter of procedures and gone right to the core of the issue.

I will add one basic point: In the past 30 years, and perhaps for another 100 years, Israel did not want, as a matter of policy, to submit a specific peace plan or to define the specific borders it wants on the pretext that the Arabs will always give it what it wants through their method of inter-Arab disputes, just as Syria did in launching the campaign against me so we could quarrel over a paper on procedures and not over the substance. The other regrettable point is that the Americans, when Vance visited me, told me that the Soviet Union had asked that all the parties be represented in all the committees when the Geneva conference is convened. This means that when the principle of withdrawal from all the territory occupied in 1967 is accepted and when I sit down in the Egyptian-Israeli committee to decide on the stages of withdrawal and the guarantees to the two sides, the Soviet Union, the United States, Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon must sit with me.

What is this? If I, who am the owner of the land and the issue, want to sit with the other party concerned, what business is it of the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Nations and all the others? If I need them, I will call on them.

I told the Americans that this was a strange procedure. They said: We are sorry. The one who asked this was the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union made this request on the basis of a request by Syria. Once again Syria wants to stand behind and be shielded by the Soviet Union and the United States. I do not hide behind anyone. I have enough confidence in myself that I can sit down face to face with the Israelis and tell them: The limit of my right is this, and the limit of your right is this. This happened in Ismailia. In Ismailia we were supposed to announce a statement of principles. But when the Israelis stuck to the idea of autonomy and did not agree to self-determination for the Palestinians, I refused to approve the issuance of a statement of principles, because this would be wrong. We are moving toward a comprehensive settlement and not toward a separate solution, as the Soviet Union has claimed.

A final point: The first one to bring the foolish words "separate solution" to the area was Gromyko, the foreign minister of the Soviet Union. We sat in Al-Qanatir for 4 hours at the time of the first disengagement of forces. The Soviet Union, Syria and the Palestinians behind them issued a statement saying the first disengagement was just a separate solution between Egypt and Israel, that the Egyptian Army had abandoned the battle and that Egypt had given up the battle. Four months later Syria concluded a disengagement of forces agreement like I did. I told them about this before, I told Hafiz al-Asad, and the Arab summit conference held in Algiers and Boumediene can bear testimony to this.

With the second disengagement the same thing happened. A statement by the Soviet Union, Syria and the Palestinians said it was a separate solution and so forth. For a year and a half they continued their attack. They said Egypt had disavowed the cause, disbanded the army and left the battle. The second disengagement took place. Egypt did not leave the battle. There has not been a separate solution. Nothing of what the Soviet Union told the Palestinians and Syria happened.

Regrettably, the same foolish policy has been maintained. After I took my initiative, the Syrian foreign minister went to Moscow to consult over the line they were to take. A statement issued in Moscow between the Soviet Union and Syria said that my initiative was only a separate solution. This is the third time they have said this. They can never learn a lesson.

When the Ismailia conference was held [words indistinct] the Ismailia conference was clear: We do not want a separate solution. If we were after a separate solution, there would have been no need for my visit to Jerusalem. It would suffice for me to agree on a separate solution, because Egypt is the center of gravity. The decision on the war was taken in Egypt. The decision on peace was taken in Egypt. When they say Egypt--just as [word indistinct] and the Israelis heard me in Jerusalem and are hearing me here before you--I was always speaking on behalf of Egypt and Sudan.

The Arab nation crossed [in the October war] and regained its honor. The Arab nation became a third world power here. The Arab nation is entering peace also from here. The decision on war and the decision on peace were made here. Thus, one regrets these matters because on every occasion such as the first disengagement they have said it is a separate solution. That was disproved. On the second disengagement they said it was a separate solution and again that was disproved. And again now with the same foolishness they are saying the same thing and it has been disproved before the entire world, because we work in broad daylight and not behind the scenes.

As-Sadat Leaves Khartoum

NC081138Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1130 GMT 8 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Khartoum, 8 January--President Anwar as-Sadat and the delegation accompanying him left Khartoum at 1245 today.

Views 'Completely Identical'

NC081538Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1500 GMT 8 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Khartoum, 8 January--Abu al-Qasim Muhammad Ibrahim, the Sudanese first vice president, has stated that druing their discussions today, Presidents Ja'far Numayri and Anwar as-Sadat agreed on the steps to be taken after the announcement of the proclamation of principles which will be issued by the joint Egyptian-Israeli military and political committees on 16 January.

The Sudanese first vice president added that the two presidents have also agreed on the steps which will stop the Soviet interference in the African Continent and expose this interference to the peoples of the continent on the basis that it is an issue which must be confronted by a joint effort of all African peoples so that they may be able to safeguard their freedom and sovereignty. In a statement made after President as-Sadat's departure from Khartoum today, Abu al-Qasim said that the Egyptian and Sudanese views were completely identical on all political questions at the Arab and African levels. There was also full agreement in the area of coordination between the two countries in all fields.

Defense Council To Meet Soon

NC091129Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1055 GMT 9 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Khartoum, 9 January--Gen Muhammad 'Abd al-Ghani al-Jamasi, deputy prime minister and minister of war and war production, has stated that the Egyptian-Sudanese Joint Defense Council will meet soon to continue its work in bolstering the efforts of the two countries in the military sphere.

In a statement published by the Sudanese newspaper AL-AYYAM today, Al-Jamasi said that the relations between the two countries require that they follow up on the current events in the Arab and African regions from time to time. Al-Jamasi, who was a member of the official delegation which accompanied President as-Sadat, said that the talks between Presidents as-Sadat and Numayri dealt with the developments in the African Continent, particularly in the Horn of Africa, and all that is of interest to the two countries in the military sphere.

BEGIN ISSUES WARNING TO EGYPT AT HERUT PARTY MEETING

TA081819Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1705 GMT 8 Jan 78 TA

[From the Evening Newsreel]

[Text] Prime Minister Menahem Begin declared this evening that Israel had presented a peace proposal, and if the other party does not accept it, the government is entitled, according to international law, to state that its plan is null and void. It will also be entitled to decide on territorial changes. To hear the prime minister's statement before members of the Herut Party center, we shall switch over to our correspondent Sara Frankel at the mobile broadcasting unit:

[Frankel--live] At the beginning of his speech the prime minister wished to make a statement about what has been made public across the border [in Egypt]:

[Begin--begin recording] President as-Sadat stated he would not tolerate Israeli civilian settlements after the signing of a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel. The term used was "will not tolerate." With respect and in friendship, I will say from this platform to President as-Sadat that this intransigence and rigidity, which is being demonstrated by the words "will not tolerate," can make no beneficial contribution to the peacemaking process. We are not using such expressions because we desire an agreement and the signing of peace treaties.

I informed President as-Sadat in Ismailia that our army is in Sinai by virtue of law, because the 6-day war was a defensive war according to the fullest meaning of that concept. I also told President as-Sadat in Ismailia that, in accordance with international law, when a defensive war is conducted, one has the right to make territorial changes, provided of course, that they are agreed upon in the peace treaties.

We proposed a compromise settlement, that is to say: The civilian settlements in the Sinai approaches--or in the Rafah approaches--as well as along the Gulf of Elat, will remain as they are. They will be defended by an Israeli defensive force. I told President as-Sadat in Ismailia: We are honoring your principles and we hope that you will honor our principles. And it is our principle, in view of the experience of a generation, not to leave a single Jewish settlement without an Israeli defensive force. They will be linked to the law and administration of the State of Israel. This is a compromise proposal which is fair and it is supported today by the United States and by Britain as well.

This, of course, is our proposal. If the Egyptian delegation rejects it, the Government of Israel may find it necessary to inform it that, according to the great rule of international law, which postulates that if one party presents a proposal for the discussion of a peace treaty and the other party does not accept it, the proposing party is entitled to declare that its proposal is null and void a priori, then the Israeli delegation will be entitled, should the cabinet so decide, to insist on the demand for territorial changes on the international border, again according to the international law, pertaining to a defensive war.

President as-Sadat said the Israelis can liquidate or burn their settlements. I will suggest to him, again with all due respect, that the Israelis and the Egyptians should agree to leave the monopoly for the burning of cities to Nero, the emperor of Rome. The Israelis do not burn settlements; they are building settlements and they are maintaining them.

Hence, we presented our fair proposal and we shall insist on it at the opening of the detailed negotiations in the joint political committee and, should the issue be raised, also in the joint military committee--which will start its deliberations on Wednesday in Cairo--at which we shall be represented by the defense minister. In Jerusalem the committee deliberations will begin next week, on Monday, and the foreign minister will head our representation. [end recording]

[Frankel] The prime minister also reacted to the statement of Syria's president to the effect that Syria was able to go to war without Egypt. The prime minister said: If Syria's ruler threatens Israel with war, he should know that the distance between Israel's army and Damascus is only 56 km. At the same time Mr Begin again invited Syria's president to discuss peace.

[Announcer] We shall now return to the Herut Party center meeting in Tel Aviv. Prime Minister Menahem Begin is continuing his speech. We will now switch over to our correspondent 'Oded Sapir at the mobile unit:

[Sapir--live] The prime minister ended his speech a short while ago. It is worthwhile listening to a few of his words pertaining to the plan which are directed, mainly, at those who criticize it:

[Begin--begin recording] Whoever claimed, as I heard also today, that according to our proposal the Egyptian Army will ever be deployed along the international border between Israel and Sinai is wrong or misleading. There was never any such idea, not even by analogy. We are proposing a complete security belt beyond the international border, inside Sinai. The separation line between Israel and the Egyptian Army will pass along Jiddi and Mitla. This is our proposal, and we insist on this demilitarization in a very wide belt.

It is true that there is an interim period--and we insist on it--and it will be determined in the military committee. But even after the interim period expires, as I have already stated, all Israeli settlements will remain as they are, and an Israeli defensive force will be the only one to defend them. No other force will defend them, nor shall we rely on others to provide defense for them.

There are further details of utmost military importance which our delegation, headed by the defense minister, will submit to the military committee that will start its deliberations in Cairo this week. But since what is in question are delicate negotiations that are due to start this week, you will understand that I had better not elaborate on these details. A main thing, however, I can state: We propose [to establish] around the State of Israel, in the south, a security belt not only for this but also for future generations. We proposed a plan for the introduction of administrative autonomy for the Arab residents in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza. In connection with this proposal, I find it necessary to repeat to you, members of the Herut movement center, the 24th clause in our plan: Israel stands firm on its right and demand for sovereignty over Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza district. Knowing that other demands exist, it proposes--for the sake of agreement and peace--to leave the problem of sovereignty over those regions open. I prevail on you to pay attention to every word written in this clause because every word here, as well as in the other clauses, was well considered. [end recording]

[Sapir] That was a recording from the prime minister's statement, and at this moment Sara Frankel has come out of the discussion hall and she has something to tell you.

[Frankel] The prime minister, at the end of his statement, after having announced on behalf of the cabinet that the IDF would remain in Judaea and Samaria, declared explicitly: We do not and will not recognize any right of Jordan to Judaea and Samaria. The prime minister said he had told this to the U.S. President, to the president of Romania, to the British prime minister and to President as-Sadat as well.

Jordan, PLO Roles Discounted

TA082011Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1800 GMT 8 Jan 78 TA

[Excerpts] Prime Minister Menahem Begin has said that Israel does not and will not recognize any right of Jordan over Judaea and Samaria. Mr Begin recalled that during the war of independence in 1948 King Husayn's grandfather, 'Abdallah, invaded the West Bank of the River Jordan from across the east bank, and it is a great rule in international law that says that a wrong does not make a right. From the start, therefore, neither Husayn nor Jordan ever had or ever will have a right of any kind to return to Judaea and Samaria. The prime minister was speaking at a meeting of the Herut Party center which is taking place in Tel Aviv this evening.

As for the PLO, the prime minister said he had concluded with the U.S. President that there would be no negotiations with that organization. The PLO is doomed to atrophy, he said. They will continue going along on the sidelines, from time to time assassinating one of their members, but since the formation of the Likud government, they should know that the era of any kind of negotiations with them has come to an end.

POST Report on Meeting

TA091028Y Jerusalem POST in English 9 Jan 78 pp 1, 2 TA

[Text] Tel Aviv--The central committee of Premier Menahem Begin's Herut Party early this morning elected Hayyim Landau, 61, as Herut's nominee for an additional cabinet seat. Landau was Begin's choice for the job.

Landau, who served in the national unity government until 1970, got 306 votes as opposed to 207 for his only opponent, Shemu'el Katz, Begin's former information adviser.

The meeting also endorsed Begin's peace proposals by a vote of 168-15. The motion read, "the central committee takes note of the government's peace plan as ratified by the Knesset."

Before the vote Begin attacked Katz and also threatened to resign if the party did not vote confidence in his peace plan. Katz criticized Begin's peace proposal for going too far, as did Ge'ula Kohen. Replying to their criticism later, Begin said they didn't know what they were talking about. "How to prevent death and bereavement in this land occupies me day and night," he said.

Katz has said that the government peace plan gives too much in Sinai in the hopes of having a stronger position in Judaea and Samaria. But this is an illusion, he warned. "What we give he (As-Sadat) puts in his pocket and then he starts from scratch." If Israel doesn't continue to give in, it will be accused of being rigid and torpedoing peace.

Katz also said it was a mistake to say the U.S. supports the plan (as Begin said). The Americans accepted the plan as a basis for negoations, but expect Israel to make further concessions in Judaea and Samaria.

He added that the plan opens the door for the return of Arab refugees and said the idea of bringing Jordan into the administration of the areas would cause continuous ferment.

Obviously perturbed that Katz's name had even been put forward, Begin said: "What did I do to deserve such sorrow? Why can't I have the man of my choice in the government I head? I want Hayyim Landau--that means I don't want Shemu'el Katz."

When Begin asked rhetorically: "Who brought this party to where it is today," someone from the floor called out: "Ge'ula!"

Landau himself told the meeting that anyone who doubts the devotion of Herut to Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip "is like someone who brings an idol into the temple." He and Begin both said Katz had failed to criticize the peace plan at earlier opportunities and questioned how anyone who opposed the plan could serve in the cabinet. Begin asked the central committee to endorse his peace plan. "I'm the leader of this movement," he said, "but if you express no confidence in me tonight, I will draw the necessary conclusions."

During the stormy 4-hour debate, which was accented by frequent shouts and interruptions, Agriculture Minister Ari'el Sharon attacked the government for being "strong on political affairs but weak on settlement." Sharon warned that Israel must establish settlements, towns, industries, factories and airports in the administered territories or it will be "overtaken by self-satisfaction....We will bring heavy calamity upon ourselves. We must look ahead and see what Israel will look like in 20 or 30 years."

Peres Endorses Begin Statement

TA082020Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1800 GMT 8 Jan 78 TA

[Text] The head of the opposition, MK Shim'on Peres, has told our political correspondent that the decision about the strengthening of the rural settlements was a good decision. Reacting to the prime minister's statement at the Herut Party center, he said he disagreed with the cabinet's tactics in the negotiations that the order of the negotiations should have been reversed: not to announce a withdrawal before actual, real negotiations. The first thing should have been to open such negotiations according to Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, keeping in mind the need for defensive borders in vital areas and the securing of freedom of shipping.

PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE DEFENDS RAFAH ACTIVITY

TA062005Y Jerusalem Domestic Television Service in Hebrew 1825 GMT 6 Jan 78 TA

[Text] Reacting to a State Department statement last night that the establishment of Israeli settlements beyond the green line constitutes a violation of international law, the prime minister's office said the following this evening:

The government has approved the preparation of land for agricultural cultivation in the Rafah approaches. This action is meant to strengthen rural settlement in the area. Israel's peace plan postulated that the Israeli settlements between Elat and Sharm ash-Shaykh, as well as in the Rafah approaches, should remain as they are. Accordingly, the aforementioned operation is also being carried out.

CABINET VOTES TO STRENGTHEN EXISTING SINAI SETTLEMENTS

TA081540Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1500 GMT 8 Jan 78 TA

[Text] The cabinet decided today by majority vote to strengthen existing settlements in the Rafah approaches and in the Gulf of Elat by increasing land earmarked for cultivation and by augmenting the urban and rural civilian population. These civilian settlements are in line with the proposals included in the Israeli peace plan and, in accordance with that plan, the settlements will remain as they are--in conformity with the arrangements brought to the knowledge of Egypt's president at the Ismailia conference.

Our political correspondent Shalom Qital reports that Minister Ari'el Sharon voted against this resolution and proposed that settlements be added in the Rafah approaches. The cabinet engaged in a lengthy debate which ended, as mentioned, with a decision to strengthen existing settlements.

On another subject the cabinet rejected a proposal by the prime minister to coopt Minister Ari'el Sharon to the political committee which is to start its discussions in Jerusalem on Monday. Many cabinet members opposed the proposal, a part of them for reasons of representation, claiming that if more than one Israeli minister is to sit opposite the Egyptian foreign minister, other parties, too, should be represented in accordance with the coalition breakdown. Others objected because of Minister Sharon's views.

The cabinet also approved a supplementary budget for the current fiscal year amounting to 17.25 billion Israeli pounds, thus increasing this year's budget to 141.2 billion pounds. Our economic correspondent Zevi Kessler reports that the additional budget does not indicate a change in the cabinet's activities and that all the changes are necessitated by the new economic policy of October. In the wake of this policy export incentives were abolished and prices and salaries were increased. The supplementary budget adjusted these changes to the current budget. Changes necessitated by the new currency rates are also reflected.

Cabinet Secretary's Report

TA081741Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1700 GMT 8 Jan 78 TA

[Text] The cabinet secretary stated this afternoon that all reports published about the establishment of new settlements are a figment of the imagination. Cabinet secretary Arye Na'or stated this in a briefing of correspondents after today's cabinet session which decided to strengthen the existing settlements in the Rafah approaches and in the Gulf of Elat by increasing land planned for cultivation and by augmenting the civilian population. The cabinet secretary's statement was reported by our correspondent Efrayim Lahav.

The cabinet secretary noted that the cabinet decision adopted today essentially resembles a decision adopted by the cabinet a week ago, but the public necessity for the adoption and publication of the decision stemmed from what he described as the riotousness of the media over the last 48 hours, a riotousness that was aimed at gaining scoops, even if incorrect and achieved by violating censorship regulations. Mr Na'or said that at today's meeting no one took exception to the earlier decision.

Replying to a question, the cabinet secretary said that the numbers pertaining to the augmenting of the population and the increase of land planned for cultivation are known to the cabinet, but he was not free to reveal them.

The cabinet secretary also refused to give details of the vote by which the decision was adopted to divulge the names of the ministers who objected. He stated, at the same time, that the DMC ministers said they would submit the decision for endorsement by the Knesset Security and Foreign Affairs Committee, which they are entitled to do according to the coalition agreement, which says that if the DMC ministers object to a cabinet decision on the subject of rural settlements they are entitled to submit their objections to the Knesset Security and Foreign Affairs Committee.

Labor Raps Cabinet's 'Confusion'

TA081557Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1500 GMT 8 Jan 78 TA

[Text] The Labor Party issued a warning today against the confusion and anarchy which, according to it, exists in the cabinet on the subject of settlements, footholds and land preparations in the south of Israel. A communique by the Labor Party's reaction team says the impression is that one hand does not know what the other is doing. The Labor Party warns against the demonstrative establishment of settlements in areas in Judaea and Samaria populated by Arabs, contending that this is likely needlessly to place suspicion on Israel and worsen its international status.

9 Jan Press Comment

TA090931Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0505 GMT 9 Jan 78 TA

[Review of morning press editorials]

[Excerpt] Most papers discuss the significance of the cabinet decision taken yesterday with respect to the settlements in the Rafah salient and southern Sinai. Some papers deal with the preparations for the deliberations of the joint Israeli-Egyptian military committee.

HA'AREZ believes that the cabinet's decision has a double significance: internally, in that it rejects more far-reaching settlement plans proposed by Agriculture Minister Ari'el Sharon; externally, in that it puts an end to certain hostile interpretations that Israel is deviating from the parameters established in the dialog between Mr Begin and President as-Sadat. The vote, which showed that a majority did not support the agriculture minister's joining the Israeli delegation to the joint political committee, points, in HA'AREZ's opinion, to a degree of emancipation of some ministers from the prime minister's overly strong sway--unless we assume that Mr Begin himself did not regret that the majority in the cabinet did away with Mr Sharon's candidacy. At any rate the prime minister's prestige has not been tarnished by accepting, as a loyal disciple of democracy, the ruling of the majority.

HAZOFE says that side by side with the cabinet's decision we have to make it clear to the residents of the settlements in the Rafah salient and southern Sinai that the government will not abandon them from a political point of view and will support their rights throughout the negotiations. The political struggle has always been accompanied by settlement acts, and in this regard the government is continuing the policy of previous governments.

In DAVAR's opinion, the settlements in the Rafah salient and in southern Sinai, which were established by the authorized institutions, need and deserve practical and psychological encouragement in the present situation. This does not change the status quo substantively from the point of view of negotiations and the possibility of an agreement. If the government is to be congratulated for rejecting, with its decision, pressures which would be damaging to Israel had they been effective, the act, on the other hand, of permitting settlement in Shilo under Gush Emunim pressure is to be regretted. Israel will gain nothing from this.

'AL HAMISHMAR writes that we should not ignore the disorganization characteristic of the government's activity on the settlement issue over the past week. For the past few days Israeli and world public opinion has been fed reports of a huge settlement momentum planned by the minister of agriculture. The minister claims that his plans fit in with the government's decisions, while it is now apparent that yesterday the government again made a decision going against the grain of Mr Sharon's planned operations. These plans have caused much political damage. How will a government function which has, until now, been blessed with order and discipline, something which has distinguished it from previous governments?

OMER writes that it does not oppose, nor does it agree with, the government's decisions about continued settlement in the Yamit region. The newspaper says that it cannot take a stance because it cannot understand the government's position.

PROPOSALS FOR JOINT MILITARY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION OUTLINED

NC0814l4Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1100 GMT 8 Jan 78 NC

[From the Midday Newsreel]

[Text] The date of the military negotiations, the discussions of the joint military committee which will be in Egypt, has been moved up, as we have heard, and they will open on Wednesday afternoon. Several hours before that, Defense Minister 'Ezer Weizman, the chief of staff and senior officers will arrive in Cairo to prepare the opening session. Our military correspondent Romi Dani'el reports on the framework of discussions in Cairo and the subjects which are expected to be discussed:

[Dani'el--begin recording] The Israeli proposal which will apparently be put forward at the Cairo discussions divides Sinai into three regions which differ in character and by definition and are part of the security arrangements in Sinai. The first region relates to the present line of the Egyptian presence in Sinai. This line will not change very much. At any rate, the Egyptian forces will not enter the Gidi and Mitla passes, which will remain free of military forces, as they are at present.

The second region relates to all the region starting from the line of the stationing of Egyptian forces up to Al-'Arish. This region will constitute a buffer zone, which will end at Al-'Arish. From there up to the international border, or what is called the 1967 border, there will be a strip under UN domination. This will constitute the third zone. This strip will include all the Israeli settlements. The UN strip, according to the Israeli plan, will extend from Al-'Arish up to Eilat, and from Eilat up to Sharm ash-Shaykh.

In addition to this framework proposal, several additional proposals have been raised in the past relating to security arrangements which might have been primarily discussed in the Weizman-Al-Jamasi or the Begin-As-Sadat meetings. It is possible that Egyptian Foreign Minister Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil was referring to these proposals when he said, in an interview to DER SPIEGEL, that minor border adjustments might be possible on the basis of a mutual exchange of territories. In the past proposals have also been raised pertaining to reductions in the armies and their removal from the confrontation lines. These subjects will no doubt be discussed in the Cairo meetings this week. They will also apparently discuss the fate of the Israeli airports--Etam airport near Yamit, Etzion airport near Eilat and also the military airport which is located at Sharam ash-Shaykh.

As for the buffer zone, Israel is demanding warning stations there which will enable it to have intelligence control over the desert expanse.

As for Sharm ash-Shaykh, Israel has proposed that the waterway be termed an international waterway free for navigation.

In view of all this As-Sadat says this morning in an interview to OCTOBER magazine that no Israeli will remain in Sinai. The Egyptian president adds that there will be neither a military nor a civilian presence. He is prepared for the stationing of an international force in Sharam ash-Shaykh on the condition that it will not contain any Israelis. As-Sadat adds: I repeat that withdrawal from Egyptian territory to beyond the international borders is a fact on which we have agreed completely and, as far as this subject is concerned, there are no differences of views between Israel and Egypt.

The Israeli proposal conforms to this definition by As-Sadat, and the Israeli proposals which I have detailed are intended to grant security means to Israel over which it will be in charge, and not a third party, when the evacuation of Sinai is completed.

On Wednesday Defense Minister 'Ezer Weizman; Chief of Staff Mordekhay Gur; the chief of the intelligence branch, Sehlomo Gazit; and the head of the planning division, Abraham Tamir, will leave for Cairo. In the second stage of the discussions Generals Eytan and Shafir are also expected to participate. [end recording]

CABINET APPROVES DELEGATIONS TO TALKS WITH EGYPT

TA081640Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1600 GMT 8 Jan 78 TA

[Excerpt] The composition of Israel's delegation to the political committee was determined by the cabinet to be as follows: It will be headed by the foreign minister, at whose side will be the deputy defense [as heard] minister, the Foreign Ministry's legal adviser and the director general of the Foreign Ministry. The composition of the political delegation was approved by the cabinet by a majority vote, as there also were other proposals.

On the other hand, the cabinet unanimously approved the composition of Israel's delegation to the military committee. It will be headed by the defense minister. When the defense minister is absent, the deputy defense minister will substitute. Other members on the military delegation are: the chief of staff; the head of the IDF planning branch, which jointly serves the Defense Ministry and the general staff; the head of the intelligence branch; and other officers as required. The Foreign Ministry will be represented on the military committee by Moshe Sasson, adviser to the foreign minister.

The military committee will meet for its first session on Wednesday, 11 January. The political committee will meet next week on Monday, 16 January.

DAVAR: NO CONCESSION ON SINAI EARLY WARNING STATIONS

TA081408Y Tel Aviv DAVAR in Hebrew 8 Jan 78 p 1 TA

[By DAVAR military correspondent]

[Text] Defense circles announced over the weekend that Israel has not conceded on the early warning stations in Sinai, even after the withdrawal, in the framework of the peace agreement with Egypt. Israel also wants to continue to run the 'Itam and 'Eziyon airfields across the green line. It was pointed out that the continued existence of Israeli settlements across the international line is indisputable.

The circles said that senior members of the Defense Ministry are not happy that the deliberations about a peace agreement with Egypt will begin on the basis of a return to the international border. However, it is impossible to begin negotiations with President as-Sadat without Israel's undertaking to return to this border.

Defense Minister 'Ezer Weizman and his deputy, Mordekhay Zippori, submitted the point about returning to the international line to two teams established by the Ministry of Defense: the political-strategic team headed by Maj Gen Avraham Tamir and the military IDF general headquarters team headed by a senior staff officer and consisting of representatives from the operations department. The two teams prepared the working paper before the prime minister departed for his meeting with the U.S. President as well as the Israeli plan for an agreement which Defense Minister 'Ezer Weizman brought to his meetings with Al-Jamasi and As-Sadat in Egypt. The working papers prepared by the teams were discussed with the defense minister and later submitted to the prime minister and finally to the Ministerial Committee for Security Affairs. The teams prepared the working plans for the agreement with Egypt and also Israeli proposals on the issue of Judaea and Samaria.

After the Ismailia talks the two teams continued their work. Major General Tamir was then appointed to head the military team.

DAYAN COMMENTS ON POLITICAL COMMITTEE AGENDA, PEACE TALKS

TA091113Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1100 GMT 9 Jan 78 TA

[Text] Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan said that for the time being the agenda for the deliberations of the Israeli-Egyptian joint political committee has not yet been determined and the parties are negotiating on this. The foreign minister made these remarks at Ben-Gurion Airport prior to his departure for Italy.

Replying to a question from our political correspondent Shalom Qital, Dayan said that both Israel and Egypt have submitted agendas for the deliberations of the political committee. The Egyptians have submitted their proposals to us in a message. Some of them are acceptable to us and others are not. Therefore, if an agenda is not agreed upon in advance the political committee will convene without one.

He confirmed that Israel proposes that the political committee first discuss the issue of the Israeli settlements in Rafah and in other regions. Dayan stressed that the Egyptians know our position, that Israel must be permitted to have agricultural settlements in Sinai and that these settlements must be defended by the IDF and be under Israeli administration.

The foreign minister said that he regrets that Minister Ari'el Sharon was not appointed a member of the Israeli delegation to the political committee. Mr Dayan pointed out that he supported Minister Sharon's joining the delegation and added that during the political committee deliberations he will consult with the agriculture minister and with the entire government.

Previews Talks With Pope

TA091325Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in English 1200 GMT 9 Jan 78 TA

[Text] Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan left this morning on a visit to Italy. He is to have talks with Pope Paul on the future of the Christian holy places in Jerusalem.

At the airport this morning Dayan said that the general purpose of his trip was the on-going process of explaining Israel's position to the international community. About the Christian holy places, he said: [begin recording]

[Dayan] I am not going to discuss with him the Christian places. What I am going to talk about, as far as we are concerned, about our peace proposals for the Palestinian Arabs and with the Egyptians, and as far as Jerusalem is concerned and the holy places are concerned--this is a part of our peace plan, as is well known, about free admittance and free worshiping of all the respective religions in their holy places.

[Unidentified questioner] Egypt has said that Mr Begin's remarks last night are astonishing and inconsistent, about the settlement. Is Israel going to continue to build up its settlement in occupied territory while the peace negotiations exist?

[Answer] I have nothing to add to the resolution of the Israeli cabinet which was announced yesterday, and that really expresses the Israeli views and decision about it. And I just said in Hebrew, not only about what we are and what we are not going to do but about the different issues and problems and so on. I personally would rather wait until the different committees meet, which is in a week's time, and deal with that in the committees rather than to the media and so on.

[Question] Do you think then that it is harmful to the peace prospects, what is going on now? [words indistinct]

[Answer] No, not at all, not at all. I agree fully with the Israeli Government decision and practice.

[Question] Your Egyptian opposite number has suggested the possibility of territorial exchange in the Sinai and in the Negev as a possible solution to the Israeli settlements which are in northern Sinai. Does Israel reject the idea of a possible territorial exchange?

[Answer] I think that the proper place to deal with that would be in the committees and not here.

[Question] Is there any plan to bring in the Vatican as a custodian in any way, shape or form?

[Answer] No, I am not going with any plan to the Vatican, but I understand that the Vatican will bring the issue up. [end recording]

BANGLADESH

BRITISH PRIME MINISTER ENDS OFFICIAL VISIT

BK061256Y Dacca Overseas Service in English 1230 GMT 6 Jan 78 BK

[Text] The British prime minister, Mr James Callaghan, left Dacca this afternoon for New Delhi at the end of his 3-day visit to Bangladesh. Talking to newsmen at the airport he said his country is willing to do everything possible to help Bangladesh in its development efforts. He said the people of Bangladesh are putting in a great deal of effort to assist themselves.

The British prime minister said he is convinced that the way the people of Bangladesh are trying to tackle their problems will prove to be successful. He said he is carrying with him the impression of tremendous development activities in this country.

Asked about the prospects of British investments in the private and public sectors, Mr Callaghan said cooperation is possible in the fields of power, water resources and gas developments.

He said he was overwhelmed by the hospitality extended to him and members of his party during their stay in Bangladesh. Mr Callaghan said Britain has many friends in Bangladesh and so have the people of this country in Britain.

The British Prime Minister and Mrs Callaghan were given a hearty sendoff from Dacca. They were seen off at the airport by the President and Begum Ziaur Rahman. Others present at the airport were the vice president, Mr Justice Abdus Sattar, members of the Presidential Council of Advisors, the services chiefs, diplomats and high civil and military officials. A contingent of the three services presented a guard of honor to the distinguished guests. As the distinguished guests boarded the plane a 19-gun salute was boomed.

Earlier, during his visit to Chittagong, the British prime minister said Britain will continue to expand its assistance to the marine academy at Jaldia in the district. He said a vast a river system penetrating deep into the country has naturally developed a maritime tradition for the people of Bangladesh. He said he was glad to learn that this academy is being developed as one of the finest merchant navy training establishments.

The presidential adviser for port shipping and IWT [Inland Water Transport], Capt Nurul Haq, in his speech thanked the British Government for its generous help in rehabilitating the shipping and inland water transport sector in Bangladesh after liberation.

INDIA

BRITISH PRIME MINISTER CALLAGHAN ARRIVES IN DELHI

BK061605Y Delhi Domestic Service in English 1530 GMT 6 Jan 78 BK

[Text] The British prime minister, Mr James Callaghan, said on arrival in New Delhi this evening that India, as the 10th largest industrialized nation, has much to contribute to the world. In a speech at the airport he said he looks forward to discussing this aspect of India's role with the Indian prime minister, Mr Desai, and others. Mr Callaghan, accompanied by Mrs Audrey Callaghan, was given a warm and ceremonial welcome when he flew in from Dacca on a 6-day visit to this country. They were received at the airport by a large distinguished gathering headed by the prime minister, Mr Desai. Accompanied by the prime minister, Mr Callaghan and party later drove in a motorcade to the Rashtrapati Bhavan.

Mr Callaghan said although Europe knows India intellectually, the fact that this country has made a tremendous advance has not been (?observed) there. This progress has been made since 1947 when the country's energies were released from colonial bondage. It has that intangible quality of leadership which does not come from material strength or population alone, but springs from India's culture and philosphy.

The AIR [All-India Radio] correspondent says that the British prime minister departed almost entirely from his prepared text and his extemporal remarks, sparkling with wit and humor, were greeted with repreated cheers. He spoke of Mr Morarji Desai as a man to whom he always listens. About India-British ties, Mr Callaghan said these are very close and cannot be destroyed.

Meets Desai, Calls on President

BK070914Y Delhi Domestic Service in English 0830 GMT 7 Jan 78 BK

[Text] The British prime minister, Mr James Callaghan, had talks lasting about 1 and 1/2 hours with Mr Morarji Desai in New Delhi today. He said later they had a fruitful morning discussing a number of subjects of bilateral and several international issues. Mr Callaghan told newsmen that Britain would be ready to help with the Brahmaputra-Ganges water project with Bangladesh and, at a later stage, with Nepal. Britain will also help India in its fertiliser project over the next 3 years at an estimated outlay of 10 million pounds a year. The fertiliser will be sold in about a 100 villages in 10 different states. The proceeds from the sales of the fertiliser are to be used for adopting villages to improve conditions there and for the purchase of agricultural equipment.

Mr Callaghan said that their talks also covered East-West relations, the west Asian crisis and some problems connected with the north-south dialog. He, however, parried questions by newsmen about whether nuclear defense matters were also discussed. He said there are some questions of delicacy between our governments about which he did not wish to divulge anything. He, however, added that he and Mr Desai find it very easy to talk to each other, because they approach things from the same angle in many ways.

Earlier Mr Callaghan called on the president, Mr Sanjeeva Reddy. Mrs Audrey Callaghan and Mrs Reddy were also present. The External Affairs Minister Mr Vajpayee called on the British prime minister this morning. After laying a wreath on the samadhi [monument] of Gandhiji at Rejghat, Mr Callaghan wrote in the visitors book that the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi are as fresh and relevant today as they were during his lifetime. Mr Callaghan was presented a set of 70 volumes of the collective works of Mahatma Gandhi.

Callaghan, Desai Speak at Reception

BK071656Y Delhi ISI in English 1556 GMT 7 Jan 78 BK

[Text] British Prime Minister James Callaghan said in New Delhi Januray 7 that he had the opportunity to consult at length with Morarji Desai on the "many questions that confront us both and to strengthen the already warm relations which have existed for so long between our two countries," reports SAMACHAR.

He was speaking at a civic reception accorded him and his wife Audrey at the historic Red Fort where he arrived straight from the official talks at Southblock, the Indian premier's office.

Callaghan added: "But as well as studying your views on these great international questions I want also to learn how you are tackling your national problems and to pool our experience with your experience."

Callaghan said the problems of the world's cities were not identical. The major difference related to population. "In London," he said, "we are experiencing the opposite phenomenon--the population has actually been falling for a decade and more.

"That has created problems too, as both workers and jobs have moved out of industrial areas leaving empty space behind them." "So we need different solutions--you an active policy for rural development to stem the flow from the land and we, through our aid programme, will help you in that--with a policy to encourage a viable manufacturing industry in our cities and create new well-paid jobs," the British premier said.

Welcoming the first Labour prime minister of Britain to visit India, Prime Minister Morarji Desai said India did not regard British guests as mere foreigners but fellow members of a Commonwealth. "This special quality of the continuing relationship between the Indians and British is an enigma to the outside world."

Callaghan said that in Britain opinion had turned decisively against largescale redevelopment of cities with all the disruption and the social unrest it caused. It had turned towards a mere [as received] piecemeal process of renewal and repair.

"Also, we look more and more to the small firms for jobs and not to the giant firms. There is a parallel here with your interest in intermediate technology as a way of creating jobs," the British premier added.

There was a burst of cheer when Callaghan ended his speech in Hindi: "To be in Delhi is a source of great happiness."

Callaghan was presented with an ivory table lamp by the mayor, R.K. Gupta. Mrs Audrey Callaghan was presented with a Banarasi shawl and a golden thread embroidered purse.

Desai said: "In no area has our exchange of experience been so creative as in the matter of parliamentary democracy and we would like to recall our deep debt of gratitude to Britain in this regard."

He said the greatest single problem of the world in the next quarter of a century was going to be the cooperation between the north and the south. "Here the British and the Indians have unique experience in partnership (sometimes unequal and at other times equal) in negotiations and most of all reaching an equitable solution."

"Inevitably over the last 30 years our two countries, separated as we are by distance and cultural backgrounds, have at times seemed to have drifted apart--both countries have developed new and insistent loyalties," he said, adding that Britain was a member of the European community while India was proud to belong to Afro-Asia and the nonaligned world.

This however does not mean that our relationship in economic, commercial or cultural terms needs be eroded," Desai said.

Desai said that beneath surface parallels and differences the great common reality "continues to be faith in freedom of speech and thought, in the basic rights of man, in the dignity of the human individual."

"It is these shared beliefs which should sustain us through difficult periods when our different geographical situations compel divergent policies in some matters of detail." He said that even in the days before independence India produced great parliamentarians of the stature of Gokhale, Motilal Nehru and Vithalbhai Patel.

"We have attempted to continue this tradition and we are trying scupulously to respect in the new conditions which obtain after the last general elections the supremacy of parliament". India had taken over the British parliamentary system and adopted it to suit her multiregional and multilingual society, he said.

Desai spoke of the key figures of modern India representing the successful fusion of Indian and British traditions--Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Tagore and Subhas Chandra Bose. That was why the struggle was peaceful, the transfer of power so orderly and the transition from the empire to the Commonwealth was so acceptable to India.

"Today, 30 years later, the Commonwealth is still relevant as an organisation cooperating effectively in some very urgent and topical problems, like that of South Africa, and some others less dramatic but more significant in the long run, like the cooperation between developed and developing countries," he said.

Referring to the relevance of the English language and culture "to our life today", Desai said: "Our generation is now engaged in the inevitable task of rediscovering our national identity after centuries of internal conflict and foreign rule. This is bound to affect the position of the English language it once occupied in this country.

"This does not, however, mean that we would deny to ourselves the practical as well as cultural benefits of familarity with this most eloquent and popular of languages. Whatever might be the point of view of some angry young men in your own country, we in India are convinced that institutions like the British Council and the BBC are playing a vital role in keeping our cultural links alive."

Desai, Callaghan Continue Talks

BK081102Y Delhi General Overseas Service in English 1000 GMT 8 Jan 78 BK

[Text] The prime minister has expressed the hope that well-wishers of South Asia will discourage outmoded ideas of balancing tensions and help in reinforcing regional stability. Mr Morarji Desai said this will enable the South Asian nations to direct their resources more vigorously for economic development. Mr Morarji Desai was speaking at banquet given in honor of the British prime minister, Mr James Callaghan, in New Delhi last night.

He said India is seeking to build bridges with the developed world and establish new sinews of cooperation with the industrialized nations. Mr Desai said that both India and Britain had historic links, and the current visit of Mr Callaghan will further deepen and strengthen the cooperation between the two countries. He hoped that the visit will usher in a new era of stabilized and cooperative relations.

In his reply, the British prime minister stressed the need to raise the living standard of the people in Southeast Asia. Mr Callaghan said India has already achieved miracles. In this context he referred to the Green Revolution in India and the magnificent beginning made by her as an industrial power and a producer of foodgrains. He said both the countries can and should cooperate closely in future not only to benefit their own people but also the world at large. He hinted that he would spell out this cooperation when he addresses members of the Indian parliament tomorrow.

Callaghan Addresses News Conference

BK090916Y Delhi Domestic Service in English 0830 GMT 9 Jan 78 BK

[Text] The British prime minister, Mr Callaghan, has said that India can accept full safeguards for its nuclear installations even without adhering to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

Addressing a news conference in New Delhi today, he said he does not consider the treaty as central to the problem though it is an important adjunct to the control of nuclear proliferation. He had been told by Mr Morarji Desai that India expects states having nuclear weapons to agree on a comprehensive test ban treaty and to make determined efforts for the progressive reduction of their stocks with the aim of eliminating these weapons. On this basis India will be prepared to accept full-scope safeguards for all its nuclear installations. Mr Callaghan said Britain will make every effort for the achievement of this abjective and create conditions in which India may accept full safeguards.

Recalling that India has already pledged not to make explosions, he said he was greatly encouraged by what Mr Desai had told him. It represents a further step toward a safer world, he added. Asked about China and France, both owning nuclear weapons, Mr Callaghan said at present his country, the United States and the Soviet Union are engaged in negotiations for a test ban treaty which he hoped would come to a successful conclusion. Other countries could also adhere to it. He said it is natural for all countries to try to benefit from nulcear energy. At the same time nuclear destruction must be averted.

The other subjects to dominate the press conference was the idea of harnessing the rivers in the eastern region of the subcontinent, in which Britain has shown great interest. Mr Callaghan referred to his visit to Bangladesh and the improvement in the relations between that country and India. Mr Callaghan said India had indicated to him its interest in the British Jaguar aircraft, but on this the Indian military experts have to decide whether it meets their requirements. A British team will be coming to New Delhi shortly in this connection.

The British leader confirmed that he will be visiting Cairo on Friday on his way back home to have talks with President as-Sadat.

PAKISTAN

UAE'S AL NUHAYYAN ARRIVES IN KARACHI 7 JAN

BK081002Y Karachi Overseas Service in Bengali 0115 GMT 8 Jan 78 BK

[Text] The president of the United Arab Emirates, Shaykh Zayid ibn Sultan Al Nuhhyyan, arrived in Karachi yesterday on an unofficial visit.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

DAILY REPORT volumes are published Monday through Friday in both paper version (mailed daily) and microfiche version (mailed weekly). Annual subscription including occasional supplements is, for the first volume, $125 paper/$100 fiche; each additional area volume up to seven, $70 paper/$60 fiche; all eight volumes $575 paper/$500 fiche. Foreign subscription for the first volume $160 paper/$125 fiche; each additional area volume up to seven, $70 paper/$60 fiche; all eight volumes for $610 paper/$525 fiche. Each additional paper or fiche subscription beyond eight is $50. The volumes are: I—People's Republic of China; II—Eastern Europe; III—Soviet Union; IV—Asia & Pacific; V—Middle East & North Africa; VI—Latin America; VII—Western Europe; VIII—Sub-Saharan Africa. Back issues or single copies are not available. Allow 30 days for processing new subscriptions. Mail remittances, inquiries, and address changes to the NTIS address below.

Note: The publications of the Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS), which are sometimes cited in the DAILY REPORT, can also be ordered from NTIS in single copies or by subscription. In ordering, please cite the JPRS title, number, date, and author if applicable.

Both the DAILY REPORT and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at public and university libraries throughout the United States.

N T I S

National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Springfield, Virginia 22151